

The
American Historical Review

THE POLICY OF FRANCE TOWARD THE MISSISSIPPI
VALLEY IN THE PERIOD OF WASHINGTON
AND ADAMS¹

THE interest of France in the Mississippi valley extended over nearly two centuries. It falls into three main periods: (1) the unsuccessful attempt to outrival England as mistress of this region in the struggles of the colonial era; (2) the alliance with the United States in order to disrupt the British empire in our War for Independence; (3) the efforts to render the United States subservient to France and to rebuild French power in the interior of North America, ending with the cession of Louisiana. There is a striking continuity in the efforts of France to unite the fortunes of the region beyond the Allegheny mountains with those of the province of Louisiana and to control the Mississippi valley. This she desired to do, as a bar to the advance of England; as a means of supplying the French West Indies; as a lever by which to compel the United States to serve the interests of France; and as a means of promoting French ascendancy over Spanish America. France recognized that the effective boundary of Louisiana must be the Allegheny mountains, not the Mississippi river.

It is desired here to present some of the evidences of this policy, to exhibit the various forms which it took at different periods, and to explain the causes that affected the desire of France to control this important region. As will appear, the problem was a part of the larger problem of successorship to the power of Spain in the

¹ This paper makes free use of two articles by the present writer, published in the *Atlantic Monthly* for May and June, 1904, under the title, "The Diplomatic Contest for the Mississippi Valley." The principal purpose of this paper is to furnish the necessary citations for some of the assertions made in these articles and to consider more fully the French side of these diplomatic intrigues.

New World, but the specific forms that French policy assumed were more immediately dependent upon the Louisiana question.

The suggestion made by France in the peace proposals of 1761, that a barrier country, or Indian reservation, should be formed between Louisiana and the Allegheny mountains, exhibits an early form of her desire to prevent the encroachments of English-speaking people into the valley,¹ and the use to be made of the Indians as a means of holding this region open to the purposes of France and Spain, closely allied in the family compact of that year. The refusal of England and the final defeat of the allies led to the readjustment of 1763, by which France yielded her American possessions east of the Mississippi to England. She ceded New Orleans with the province of Louisiana to Spain.² The cession of Florida to England by Spain left the Gulf of Mexico divided between these last-named powers. Doubtless France yielded the province without keen reluctance, for it had been an unprofitable possession; but the intimate connection between Spain and France seemed to make the transfer something less than an absolute relinquishment.

The English policy with regard to the interior must certainly have been acceptable to her recent enemies, for, by the proclamation of 1763, the king reserved the lands beyond the Alleghenies to the Indians, and declared that until the crown was ready to extinguish the Indian title, lands should not be patented within that area, nor settlers enter it. Although the Indian line was changed by purchases, and the colony of Vandalia was all but organized at the opening of the Revolution,³ yet, when France had to determine her attitude toward the United States at the outbreak of that war, the trans-Allegheny region was still, in the eyes of the English law, almost entirely Indian country.

It is impossible here to review the connection of France with the colonies during the Revolution; but some of the essential features of the policy of Vergennes must be stated in order to understand later events, and to perceive the continuity of French policy.

There was published in Paris, in 1802, a *Mémoire historique et politique sur la Louisiane, par M. de Vergennes*.⁴ This document

¹ Winsor, *The Mississippi Basin*, 416.

² See the important paper, based on Spanish documents, by Dr. William R. Shepherd, in *Political Science Quarterly*, September, 1904 (XIX, 439-458), "The Cession of Louisiana to Spain."

³ G. H. Alden, *New Governments West of the Alleghanies*, Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, Economics, Political Science and History Series, II, 19 ff., 38 ff.; V. Coffin, *The Province of Quebec and the Early American Revolution*, *ibid.*, I, 398-431.

⁴ There are copies in the library of Harvard University, in the Library of Congress, and in the Wisconsin State Historical Library. John Quincy Adams notes in his diary

was found, according to the statement of its editor, among the minister's papers after his death, with his coat of arms at the head of the memoir. It is not known whether this memoir is to be found in the French archives, and, without further proof of its authenticity, doubts may be raised concerning it. Nevertheless, apparently both French and American bibliographers have accepted its genuineness.¹ The memoir was written prior to the alliance of 1778, and it includes not only a survey of the resources and history of Louisiana, but also an examination of the proper policy for France toward the United States, in the event of the independence of the latter power. Apprehending that the new republic would prove harmful to the interests of France and Spain in America, Vergennes (assuming that he was, indeed, its author) advised the king to insist, in the treaty which France expected to dictate to England at the conclusion of hostilities, that the territory beyond the Alleghenies and east of the Mississippi should revert to herself. He contended that this territory was properly a part of Louisiana, and not rightfully to be claimed by the American colonies under their charters. To carry out this idea he proposed the plan of a treaty to be imposed upon England at the termination of the war. This provided for the cession to France by England of the trans-Allegheny territory and for such a partition of Canada as would insure Louisiana from attack by way of the Great Lakes. The proposed boundaries were outlined in the document.² The territory thus to be acquired was to be joined with

(IV, 126) in 1818 that de Neuville, the French minister to the United States, "returned the Memoir of Count de Vergennes upon Louisiana, which he had some time since borrowed of me".

¹ In his *Voyage à la Louisiane* (Paris, 1802), 4-5 Baudry des Lozières, influenced, possibly, by the apprehension of a competing account of Louisiana, expresses doubts of the authenticity of this memoir in the following passage:

"Mais instruit que la Louisiane allait nous être rendue, je me ressouvins de mes notes, et je travaillais à en tirer quelque parti pour la chose publique, quand parut un ouvrage intitulé: *Mémoires de M. de Vergennes, ministre des affaires étrangères*. Je le lus d'abord rapidement; je le parcourus de nouveau, et je m'en voulais à moi-même de ne pas le trouver digne de son auteur. Enfin, après l'avoir bien examiné, je me décidai à croire que le nom de l'auteur était supposé. Si M. de Vergennes a quelque part à ces mémoires, ce n'est que pour très-peu, et le reste est d'une obscurité telle qu'il est impossible d'avoir, d'après cette lecture, une idée nette de la Louisiane.

Cependant je dois dire que celui qui a été sur les lieux, supplée aisément à ce qui manque à ces mémoires, et que ce qu'on y voit n'est obscur que faute d'avoir été rédigé par une personne qui connaisse l'objet qu'on traite. Néanmoins cet ouvrage n'est pas sans mérite pour l'homme d'état; et quel que soit celui qui se cache sous le nom imposant de M. de Vergennes, il ne rend pas moins des services par plusieurs de ses vues qui sont très-sages. Persuadé que ces mémoires ne pouvaient faire de tort à mon projet, je continuai mon travail, et ce que je vais dire n'est que le développement des notes que j'avais déjà prises dans mes voyages."

² The substance of this project is as follows (*Mémoire*, 108-114):

ARTICLE I. England shall restore to France all the conquests which she made in

Louisiana, which, he proposed, should be retroceded to France. Thus a revived French colonial empire would be created on both banks of the Mississippi, reaching to the Great Lakes and dominating the Gulf of Mexico. He warned the king that when the people of the United States once obtained their independence, they would not rest content with having defended their own hearth-fires, but would desire to expand over Louisiana, Florida, and Mexico, in order to master all the approaches to the sea. On the other hand, if France possessed the Mississippi valley, the Great Lakes, and the entrance to the St. Lawrence, and if she allied herself with the Indians of the interior, she could restrain the ambitions of the Americans. Such were the proposals of this interesting memoir.

It is obvious that, if the work was that of Vergennes, M. Doniol has omitted an essential document for understanding the connection

North America during the last war. ARTICLE II. France shall reserve Louisburg and other specified areas about the mouth of the St. Lawrence and to the north. ARTICLE III. The English are forbidden to fortify within ten leagues near the eastern coast of Nova Scotia, etc. "ART. IV. Que la France rentrera aussi en possession de toute la partie occidentale du Canada, à la réserve du pays concédé à l'ouest des montagnes Apalaches; c'est-à-dire, le pays des Iroquois, les terres et rivières au sud de l'Ohio et de son cours, depuis ses sources jusqu'à la Rivière-Neuve inclusivement; dans lequel pays les Anglais ne pourront non plus conserver, ni avoir d'autres fortifications, que le fort d'Osvego, sur la rivière Chouagen, ni sur l'Ohio, que celui qu'ils ont bâti à la place du fort du Quesne. ART. V. La France conservera pour bornes au nord du pays des Iroquois et de la Nouvelle-Yorck, la rivière à la Pance et le lac du Saint-Sacrement, et à l'ouest le lac Ontario et le lac Crié [Erie], avec la propriété de toutes les terres et rivières au nord de l'Ohio, ainsi que la propriété du pays au sud de cette rivière; c'est-à-dire, des terres et rivières au-dessous, et depuis la Rivière-Neuve exclusivement jusqu'à l'embouchure de l'Ohio dans le Mississipi. ART. VI. Que pour prévenir les discussions que pourraient occasionner entre les sujets de sa majesté Très-Chrétienne et ceux de sa majesté Britannique, la trop grande proximité de leurs établissemens, dans cette patrie, les Français ne pourront en aucun temps et sous aucuns prétextes, construire ni bâtir aucuns forts sur la Belle-Rivière, entre ses sources et l'embouchure de la Rivière-Neuve, qui se dégorge à cent quatre-vingts lieues au-dessous du fort du Quesne, n'y établir les terres qui se trouvent entre le lac Crié [Erie] et la rive septentrionale de l'Ohio, depuis la rivière Casconchiagon jusqu'à l'embouchure de la rivière Souhiato; c'est-à-dire, que toute cette étendue de pays restera inculte, inhabitée et en désert. ART. VII. Qu'afin néanmoins que la France puisse mettre ses sujets et ses possessions à l'abri et à couvert des incursions des sauvages, cette couronne conservera, de son côté, le fort de Catarakoui, ou Frontenac sur le lac Ontario et le fort de Niagara, au nord du lac Crié, comme aussi le droit de se fortifier dans les autres limites, lors et ainsi qu'elle le trouvera à propos. ART. VIII. Il sera libre à toutes les nations et peuples sauvages, sous quelques dominations qu'ils soient, de changer à leur volonté de domicile, et de se retirer et de s'établir suivant leurs goûts et leurs caprices sur les domaines de l'Angleterre ou de la France, sans qu'aucune de ces deux puissances puisse jamais y porter obstacles ou s'en formaliser. *Nota.* Cet article est fondé sur l'amour de la liberté, inné chez tous les sauvages, et l'on ne peut, sans injustice, leur ôter le droit primitif de propriété sur les terres où la providence les a fait naître et placés." ARTICLE IX. Freedom of the Indians to trade with either power, but prohibition of the passage of traders of either country into the territory assigned to the other. ARTICLES X, XI, and XII provide arrangements regarding fugitives from justice among the Indians.

of France with the American Revolution.¹ The subsequent actions of Vergennes are entirely consistent with the view that he was the author of this memoir. It is true that, by the treaty of alliance of 1778, France renounced the possession of territories in North America that had belonged to England, but the student of French diplomatic relations with the United States during the Revolution will remember that the French ministers to the United States supported the Spanish contention that American rights did not extend beyond the Alleghenies, and tried to get from Congress a renunciation of the claim to that region. Vergennes instructed his representatives, also, that France did not intend to raise the United States to a position where she would be independent of French support. The proposal shown by Rayneval, the secretary of Vergennes, to Jay in 1782 presented the ideas of France. Roughly speaking, this provided that the land south of the Ohio, between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi, should be free Indian country divided by the Cumberland river into two spheres of influence, the northern to fall under the protection of the United States, and the southern under that of Spain.² The argument for this proposal submitted by Rayneval, and approved by Vergennes,³ was based upon the recognition of the independence of the Indian tribes east of the Mississippi. England was held to have admitted this by her proposals in regard to limits in 1755, and by her proclamation of 1763. By the latter document the colonies were held to be debarred from claiming to the Mississippi, and it was argued that neither Spain nor the United States had the least right of sovereignty over the savages in question.

The system of France becomes clearer when it is remembered that, under pressure from that court, in 1781, Congress had rescinded its ultimatum with regard to a Mississippi boundary, and had instructed its representatives to be guided by the advice of France as to the terms of peace. What this advice would be is shown in the *Mémoire*⁴ and in the proposition of Rayneval. By this proposal of

¹ Doniol, *Histoire de la Participation de la France à l'Établissement des États-Unis d'Amérique*.

² Wharton (ed.), *Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States*, VI, 25 ff.; *Secret Journals of Congress*, IV, 74-78; Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, VII, 118, 148.

³ Circourt, *Histoire de l'Action Commune de la France et de l'Amérique pour l'Indépendance des États-Unis*, III, 290.

⁴ Besides the projects of the *Mémoire* itself, note this significant passage (p. 103) :

“Quelque soit l'issue de la guerre des Anglais et des Américains, la fin de cette révolution ne peut finir sans que les puissances belligérantes de l'Europe ne se mêlent de la querelle, ou ne servent de médiateurs. Dans ces deux cas, un congrès général peut changer les dispositions du traité de Versailles; et, en supposant que les Provinces-Unies de l'Amérique soient séparées de leur métropole, la France est en mesure pour réclamer ses anciennes possessions.”

an independent Indian country Vergennes would avoid breaking the terms of the treaty of 1778, in regard to acquisition of English territory, and at the same time he expected effectually to withdraw the region from the Americans. Although Oswald, the English representative in the American negotiations, did not possess full information as to this device of France, nor as to her readiness to make concessions to England north of the Ohio, his construction of her policy in his letter to Shelburne, September 11, 1782, was not unfounded. He writes:

"M. de Vergennes has sent an agent [Rayneval] over to London on some particular negotiation, it is thought in favour of Spain. That Court wishes to have the whole of the country from West Florida of a certain width quite up to Canada, so as to have both banks of the Mississippi clear, and would wish to have such a cession from England, before a cession to the Colonies takes place."¹

So far, then, the actions of Vergennes accord with the ideas set forth in the memoir. A further striking evidence of the consistency of his policy with this document is the fact that he also tried to acquire Louisiana from Spain. Godoy, the Prince of Peace, declares that Vergennes, counting upon the close union of the two cabinets connected by the family compact, employed every means of persuasion "to induce Spain, already so rich in possessions beyond the sea, to give to France her ancient colony". Charles III and the count of Florida Blanca were not averse to consenting to this demand, but under the condition of reimbursement of the expenses which Spain had made for preserving and improving Louisiana. "The lack of money", says Godoy, "was the only difficulty which suspended the course of the negotiation."² It is clear, therefore, that the essential elements in the policy outlined by the memoir were followed by Vergennes in his diplomacy. The anxiety of Vergennes to protect the interests of Spain in the country between the Alleghenies and the Mississippi, when interpreted by the memoir and by his efforts to procure Louisiana from Spain, proves to be in reality an anxiety to promote the interests of France. Expecting to be put in possession of Louisiana, France herself was vitally interested in the disposal of the lands between the Mississippi and the Alleghenies. Vergennes believed that in assenting to a Mississippi boundary for the United States England had given a territory which

¹ Fitzmaurice, *Life of Shelburne*, III, 258. For Rayneval's interview with Shelburne, and his suggestion that England would find in the negotiations of 1754 relating to the Ohio the boundaries that England then saw fit to assign the colonies, see Circourt, III, 46, and Doniol, V, 133.

² J. B. D'Esménard, *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix, Don Manuel Godoy* (Brussels, 1836), III, 113.

she did not possess, and which, in fact, belonged in part to Spain and in part to the Indians.¹ The matter is important inasmuch as it reveals the emphasis which France at this period laid upon the connection of the trans-Allegheny country with Louisiana. It puts in a strong light her desire to become an American power, to place boundaries to the expansion of the United States, and to hold that country in a position of subordination to her policy. The system of Vergennes in the American Revolution cannot be rightly understood so long as the historians of the negotiations fail to comprehend his expectation that France would replace Spain in Louisiana.²

The close of this war which France had waged against England left her without the financial resources to achieve the possession of Louisiana, and her interest turned to domestic affairs. Anticipating the possibility of the dissolution of the Union, England and Spain

¹ Doniol, V, 362-365. Compare treaty of alliance, 1778, articles VI and XI.

² There are some grounds for suspecting France of desiring to evade the pledges regarding conquest in the Revolution. The question of the Canada invasion and the occupation of Detroit is one. See D'Estaing's proclamation to the French, and Lafayette's to the Indians, Kingsford's *Canada*, VI, 342, VII, 13; Washington's fears are in Sparks's *Washington*, VI, 106; cf. *Secret Journals of Congress*, II, 125; Lafayette to Vergennes, July 18, 1779, *Stevens's Facsimiles*, vol. XVII, no. 1609, from Archives des Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, IX, no. 42, fo. 154: "Shall we free our oppressed brethren, recover the fur trade, our intercourse with the Indians, and all the profits of our former establishments without their expenses and losses? Shall we throw into the balance of the new world a fourteenth state, which would be always attached to us, and which by its situation would give us a superiority in the troubles that may at some future day set America at variance? Opinions are very much divided on this point; I know yours, Monsieur le Comte, and my own inclination is not unknown to you. I do not therefore dwell on it in any sense, and regard this idea only as a means of deceiving and embarrassing the enemy." But Vergennes's policy seems to have been to leave Canada to England (Doniol, III, 566).

Colonel La Balme's attempt to take Detroit in the fall of 1780 with a force of Illinois and Indiana Frenchmen who proclaimed that they would not recognize any authority but that of the king of France, and who were aroused against the American rule by La Balme, is certainly suspicious. La Balme was in 1777 inspector of horse in Armand's legion. He was relieved from service under Congress in 1778. On June 27, 1780, from Fort Pitt, he gave a report to Luzerne, the French minister, of his proposed western visit, figuring in his talks to the Indians as a French chief, who had come to learn the real inclinations of the children of the king of France (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1888, 865). On his arrival in Vincennes and the Illinois settlements he encouraged the Frenchmen to resist American authority; they were "buoyed up with the flattering hopes of being again subject to the King of France", according to reports by Americans resident in the French villages. Indeed, he was reported to have told the Indians that in the spring there would be French troops in the Illinois country. His expedition against Detroit miscarried, and he was killed and his papers sent to Canada. Had Detroit been taken by Frenchmen of the Illinois country, who professed independence of the United States, complications to the advantage of France might have been raised in the discussion of the terms of peace. See *Michigan Pioneer Colls.*, IX, 641; *Canadian Archives*, Series B, vol. 122, p. 569; vol. 123, p. 3; vol. 182, p. 489; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1887, 228; 1888, 865, 882; George Rogers Clark MSS., vol. 50, pp. 51, 66, 71; *Calendar Virginia State Papers*, I, 380.

took measures to keep in touch with the western communities. Spain, having acquired Florida from England as a result of the war, gained the control of the navigation of the Mississippi and opened and closed the door to Western prosperity at her pleasure. She established her ascendancy over the Southwestern Indians by treaties of alliance and protection, and used them to check the American advance. Hoping to add the Kentucky, Franklin, and Cumberland settlements to the Spanish empire, she intrigued with their leaders to bring about secession.¹ England, also retaining her posts on the Great Lakes, held the Northwestern Indians under her influence and was able to infuse some degree of unanimity into their councils and into their dealings with the Americans. Her influence and the material aid furnished to the Indians enabled them to resist the American advance across the Ohio. While Spain intrigued with the West, England also sounded the leaders of that region, and in the fall of 1789 instructed Lord Dorchester, the governor of Canada, that it was desirable that the western settlements should be kept distinct from the United States and in connection with Great Britain.² The Lords of Trade, in a report of 1790, declared that it would be for England's interest "to prevent Vermont and Kentucky and all the other Settlements now forming in the Interior parts of the great Continent of North America, from becoming dependent on the Government of the United States, or on that of any other Foreign Country, and to preserve them on the contrary in a State of Independence, and to induce them to form Treaties of Commerce and Friendship with Great Britain".³

France, at the same period, was not free from interest in Western affairs. Her archives have not been sufficiently explored to make

¹For material on this subject the reader should consult Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, III; Winsor, *Westward Movement*; Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, III; T. M. Green, *Spanish Conspiracy*. McGillivray, the half-breed chief of the Creeks, informed White, the Indian agent of the United States in 1787, that if Congress would form a new state south of the Altamaha (presumably composed of the Indians), he would agree to take the oath of allegiance to it and to cede the Oconee lands to Georgia: *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I, 20-22. Compare AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VIII, 283, for evidence that the state of Franklin considered the proposition of admitting the Cherokees to representation in her legislature. For the Spanish attitude regarding the independence of the Indians, see *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I, 278-280 280; *Indian Affairs*, I, 17-19. Instructions were given to the governor of Louisiana by Spain, May 24, 1793, that the Americans should be kept from the Mississippi and the mouth of the Ohio, and that the Cumberland settlers should be restrained to the north of the Cumberland river: George Rogers Clark MSS., XL, 63. By her Indian treaties of 1792, Spain professed to have extended her limits on the east bank of the Mississippi forty leagues in one direction and sixty leagues in the other: George Rogers Clark MSS., A.

²Canadian Archives, Series Q, vol. 42, p. 153.

³AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VIII, 84.

clear how far she adhered to the desire to regain Louisiana. De Moustier, the French minister to the United States, was instructed in 1787 by Montmorin, minister of foreign affairs, that principles were in favor of Spain in the matter of the navigation of the Mississippi, and that it would pain the king if the United States should embroil themselves with that power over the question: but he was not to offer the good offices of the king, lest all parties should be compromised. This minister was further instructed that it was for the interest of France that the United States should remain in their actual condition rather than form a new constitution, because, if they secured the unity of which they were capable, they would soon acquire a force and power which they would probably be very ready to abuse.¹

Various memoirs were transmitted to the government at the close of the Confederation, describing the advantages which France would gain by recovering Louisiana,² and De Moustier sent a despatch to his court reciting the advantages which would come to France by the retrocession of Louisiana. By this France would obtain, he argued, a continental colony which would guarantee the West Indies, the most beautiful entrepôt of North America, for her commerce, and an almost complete monopoly of the products of the states situated on the Mississippi, and, in fine, the solution of the problem of French influence upon the United States, by furnishing a means of holding the government by the party which was the most sensible of its interest and its prejudices.³

It was in these closing years of the Confederation, also, that various French travelers visited the United States and reported the conditions of the lands beyond the Alleghenies. Of these the most important were Brissot and Clavière, the former afterward the real master of the foreign policy of France during the ascendancy of the Brissotins or Girondists, the latter the minister of finance in the

¹ AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VIII, 713. Cf. page 252, *ante*.

² See the intercepted memorial written about 1787, Chatham MSS., 345, and in *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1890, 108-119. Dorchester informed his government that De Moustier forwarded it to his court. It is possible that this was the work of Pierre Lyonnet; see *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 946.

³ See the letter of Fauchet, February 4, 1795, in *Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II. Jefferson had evidently received hints of De Moustier's project, for he wrote to our representative, Mr. Short, August 10, 1790, warning him to be on his guard even in communications to France. "It is believed here, that the Count de Moustier, during his residence with us, conceived the project of again engaging France in a colony upon our continent, and that he directed his views to some of the country on the Mississippi, and obtained and communicated a good deal of matter on the subject to his court." *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (ed. Ford), V, 220.

period of the dominance of that party.¹ Brissot's opinion was that the Westerners would resent the attempt of Spain to shut them off from the sea, and that "if ever the Americans shall march toward New Orleans, it will infallibly fall into their hands".

When, in the spring of 1790, war seemed imminent between England and Spain over the Nootka Sound affair,² there was every prospect that a descent would be made by the former power upon New Orleans. Indeed, Pitt listened to the plan of Miranda, the Venezuelan revolutionist, for an attack upon Spain's American possessions with a view of giving freedom to those colonies, and thereby opening their commerce to England and insuring to her a predominance in their political relations. Jefferson, seeing the danger to the United States, menaced by the possibility of England's acquiring Louisiana and Florida and thus completely surrounding us in the rear and flanks while her fleet threatened our seaboard, turned to France for assistance and instructed our representative there to attempt to secure the good offices of that nation to induce Spain to yield to us the island of New Orleans; or, since that idea might seem extreme, to urge her, at first, to recommend to Spain the cession of "a port near the mouth of the river with a circumadjacent territory sufficient for its support, well defined and extra-territorial to Spain, leaving the idea to future growth". He instructed our minister to Spain to ask for New Orleans and Florida and to argue that thus we could protect for Spain what lay beyond the Mississippi.³ His policy was, in brief, to make advances to France and Spain, but at the same time to offer neutrality to England, if she would carry out the treaty of 1783 and attempt no conquests adjoining us.

But France had other plans. After considerable discussion she finally proposed to Spain a new national pact in place of the family compact, and sent Bourgoing in 1790 to negotiate. He suggested to Spain as a consecration of their proposed new alliance the restitution of Louisiana to France.⁴ But Spain was not ready to agree to such terms; she distrusted the revolutionary advances and came to terms with England. France, perceiving the family compact no longer applicable to the new conditions, adjusted her policy to the prospect of a complete rupture with Spain. This had a most important bearing upon the New World; for France, with the fires of

¹ Brissot de Warville, *Nouveau Voyage dans les États-Unis* (Paris, 1791); Brissot et Clavière, *De la France et des États-Unis* (London, 1787); Brissot and Clavière, *Commerce of America with Europe* (New York, 1795).

² AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, VII, 706 ff.; *Atlantic Monthly*, XCIII, 680.

³ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (ed. Ford), V, 220, 229.

⁴ Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, II, 94.

the Revolution destroying the old order of things, saw the opportunity to rebuild her colonial empire at the expense of Spain.

In 1792 Talleyrand and other French agents negotiated with England informally to withdraw her from the formidable list of enemies that were uniting against France. If England joined them, the French islands would be exposed to her attack. The instructions to these agents, drawn by Dumouriez, argued that the New World was large enough for partition. Has not the time come, it was asked, to form a great combination between France and Great Britain, including, if necessary, the United States, by which the commerce of the Spanish possessions should be opened to these three powers?¹ But England was in no mood to accept the alliance of antimonarchical France, and turned a cold shoulder to these advances. France, in isolation, took up the revolutionary projects which Miranda had in 1790 unfolded to Pitt, and turned to the United States for assistance.

The need was great, for the French islands were likely to fall a prey to England in case of war, and French commerce would be exposed to the fleets of the same power. The time was also favorable, for, before the close of 1792, Washington, realizing the dangers to which the United States was exposed, with England and Spain both holding unfriendly relations with the Indians on the flanks of the United States, broached to Jefferson the question of a closer connection with France. Jefferson caught eagerly at the proposal, for, as he said, a French alliance was his "polar star".² Fortunately, however, Washington's policy turned eventually to a strict neutrality and complete freedom from foreign entanglements.

The result was Genet's mission to the United States, which has been discussed in a previous paper in the REVIEW.³ Here only the essential elements of French policy in respect to the mission can be given. In the inception of the plan, Brissot proposed to send Miranda⁴ to San Domingo, where the French garrisons, together with

¹ *Ibid.*, 384 ff., 478 ff., III, 17-21. Compare Robinet, *Danton Émigré*, 243; G. Pallain, *Le Ministère de Talleyrand sous le Directoire*, pp. xii, xlii.

² *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (ed. Ford), I, 212.

³ AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III, 650: "The Origin of Genet's Projected Attack on Louisiana and the Floridas." The documentary material, edited by the present writer, is in the *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 930-1107; 1897, 569-679; and 1903, II, 201-286; and in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, II, 474, and III, 490. See also the additional material cited in the introduction to the documents in the *Reports* above mentioned.

⁴ See Antepara, *South American Emancipation Documents* (London, 1810); Marquis de Rojas, *El General Miranda*; A. Rojas, *Miranda dans la Révolution Française*; Tejera, *Life of Miranda*; AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, III, 655, 674, 711, VI, 508; *Edinburgh Review*, XIII, 288; *Athenæum*, April 19, 1902; Sorel, *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, III, 175, et passim.

local troops, would serve as the nucleus for inaugurating a revolution among the Spanish colonies. Other forces were to be raised in the United States.¹ Lebrun, minister of foreign relations, sent word to Washington, in November of 1792, that France would revolutionize Spanish America, and that forty-five ships of the line would leave in the spring for that purpose, under command of Miranda. According to the further statement of Colonel Smith (the son-in-law of Vice-President Adams), who was the bearer of this news, they intended to begin the attack at the mouth of the Mississippi, and to sweep along the bay of Mexico southwardly, and would have no objection to our incorporating the two Floridas.² Under the influence of this information, Jefferson drafted new instructions for our commissioners to Spain, wherein he countermanded the proposal to guarantee Louisiana to Spain on condition of the cession of the Floridas. The former proposal, made in 1790, would have interfered with the freedom of the United States to act according to the new circumstances.

France, however, hesitated to plunge into this vast enterprise of Spanish-American revolution until she had overcome Holland and made herself the mistress of the Dutch marine. Then, in the opinion of Dumouriez, it would be possible to crush England and execute Miranda's project. This general, therefore, left to participate in the operations in the Netherlands and to suffer the loss of prestige which his disastrous defeat brought about. It is doubtful whether the Gironde leaders had reached an exact conclusion regarding the disposal of Louisiana and the Floridas when Genet³ was sent to the United States.⁴ The memoirs found in the archives show

¹ See A. Rojas and Antepara for the early ideas of a general movement against Spanish America on the lines of Miranda's proposals in 1790 to Pitt.

² *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (ed. Ford), I, 216-217. Compare *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I, 144; A. Rojas, 9; Antepara, 172.

³ Genet was born in 1763. He was the son of the head of the bureau of translation in the foreign office. He studied international law at Giessen, was attached to embassies at Berlin and Vienna, and was made chief of the bureau of translation at the death of his father, in 1781. He went to London in 1783 as secretary of a special embassy. In 1787 he became secretary of legation, and afterward chargé d'affaires at St. Petersburg. His revolutionary enthusiasm was so violent, however, that the Empress Catherine dubbed him "un démagogue enragé", and in the summer of 1792 he was obliged to leave the country. On his arrival at Paris, he was selected for the ministry to Holland, but it was finally determined to send him to the United States, possibly because of his relations to the king through his sister, Madame Campan, who was lady in waiting to the queen. The Girondists had seriously considered the banishment of the king to the United States, and it was thought that Genet might accompany the family. See *Washington, Jefferson, and "Citizen" Genet, 1793*, a pamphlet privately printed in 1899 by the late George C. Genet, son of the minister; see also *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, III, 656.

⁴ *Report of American Historical Association, 1896*, I, 946, note, 949, 952, 953.

that the alternatives were considered of giving them to the United States, of establishing them as independent republics, and of making them a French possession; but there can be little doubt as to what the action of France would have been in case of successful occupation of New Orleans.

Genet's instructions of December, 1792, and January, 1793,¹ written when the prospect of a war on the part of France against both Spain and England was imminent,² required him to endeavor to secure a treaty with the United States, which should guarantee the sovereignty of the people and punish the powers which had an exclusive commercial and colonial system, by declaring that the vessels of these powers should not be received in the ports of the contracting nations. This compact, in the opinion of the ministers, "would conduce rapidly to the freeing of Spanish America, to opening the navigation of the Mississippi to the inhabitants of Kentucky, to delivering our ancient brothers of Louisiana from the tyrannical yoke of Spain, and perhaps to reuniting the fair star of Canada to the American constellation". It will be observed that Canada alone was indicated as a possible acquisition by the United States. Genet was further authorized, in case of timidity on the part of the American government, to take all measures which comported with his position to arouse in Louisiana and in the other provinces of America adjacent to the United States the principles of liberty and independence. It was pointed out that Kentucky would probably second his efforts without compromising Congress, and he was authorized to send agents there and to Louisiana.

From these instructions it is clear that the conquest of Louisiana was a fundamental purpose in Genet's mission, and that he was even to proceed by an intrigue with the frontiersmen in case the American government should not connive at his designs. Under the guise of neutrality, the United States was expected to furnish in fact an effective basis for French operations. Moreover, he was instructed to make use of the Indians, "the ancient friends of the French nation", against the enemies of France. By combining the large French population of Canada and of Louisiana, where the seeds of revolution were already sown, with the frontiersmen and the Indians in the interior, there was reason to hope for a successful outcome of the enterprise.

On his arrival in Charleston, early in April, 1793, Genet found

¹ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 957-967; 1903, II, 201-211.

² War was declared against England February 1, 1793, and against Spain, March 9, 1793.

an efficient lieutenant in Mangourit, the French consul at that city.¹ The frontiersmen of Georgia and the Carolinas had suffered from the hostility of the Cherokees and the Creeks on their frontiers, and were eager to destroy the influence by which Spain supported them in their resistance to American advance. Mangourit was therefore able to enlist the services of important leaders. One of them, Samuel Hammond² of Georgia, was assigned the task of making treaties with the Creek Indians³ and of rallying the Georgia frontiersmen for an attack upon East Florida. William Tate⁴, another frontier leader, was to negotiate with the Cherokees and the Choc-taws, and to collect the frontiersmen of the Carolinas for a descent upon New Orleans by way of the Tennessee and the Mississippi. The draft of the Indian treaties⁵ provided for an alliance between France and these nations, and guaranteed to the Indians the free and peaceable possession of their lands. Genet afterward, while denying that he had authorized the collection of forces against Spain on territory of the United States, admitted that he had granted commissions to men who desired to go among "the independent Indian tribes,

¹ See F. Masson, *Le Département des Affaires Étrangères pendant la Révolution*, 323-325. Mangourit's career illustrates the fact that the representatives of France in America were influential persons. In 1789 he edited for a few months *Le Héraut de la Nation*, and was the orator of his section in the National Assembly. He came to Charleston March 2, 1792, as consul. Returning after the downfall of Genet, he was sent on a mission to consider the situation of France in regard to the Two Sicilies and Spain. He was nominated as one of the members of the new commission of foreign relations in 1794, but refused the position, and was subsequently appointed first secretary of legation in Spain. Instructions were made out for him to succeed Adet in the United States in 1796, but, probably owing to the representations of Monroe against this appointment, it was not made. He afterward held various positions in the foreign service of France, among other missions being one to incite the Greeks to insurrection. Mangourit's correspondence during Genet's mission is published in the *Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, 569-679.

² He had been a colonel of cavalry in the Revolution and surveyor-general at Savannah, and was afterward a member of Congress.

³ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, 591 ff.

⁴ If we may believe Mangourit, Tate had "all the virtues of the adventurers who conquered the two Indies, without their vices and ignorance; extremely severe to himself, drinking nothing but water; . . . a firm disciplinarian and having in his brain the coolness and the heat necessary to execute a great enterprise with small means. He conceives in the minute, decides on the instant; he carves in the right joint." *Ibid.*, 646. Tate afterward led a band of free-lances in the service of France, whither he went after the failure of Genet's plans. One of his expeditions was the descent upon Ireland (the Fishguard Bay incident) in 1797. See E. Desbrière, *Projets et Tentatives de Débarquement aux Îles Britanniques* (Paris, 1900), 238; and M. E. James, *The Fishguard Invasion by the French in 1797*. See the index to *Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, under "Tate". In the Archives Nationales, A. F., iii, 186b, are interesting letters from Tate to [Elijah] Clarke, proposing a descent upon the Bermudas in 1796.

⁵ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, 591 ff.

ancient . . . allies of France," to retaliate on the Spaniards and English.¹ The connivance of Governor Moultrie, of South Carolina, seems to have been secured. Thus Genet and his lieutenants had initiated plans for the filibustering enterprise before he had broken definitely with Washington. The Southern part of the plot was seriously interfered with later by an investigation by the legislature of South Carolina, and by the discovery that the Girondists, and Genet in particular, were "friends of the blacks".

On his arrival at Philadelphia, Genet found much popular discontent with Washington's proclamation of neutrality issued on April 27, and he came to the conclusion that he would be able to reverse the executive policy by procuring a majority in Congress favorable to his plans. The "appeal to the people" which he proposed was rather an attempt to secure a majority friendly to France in Congress, for he believed that in that body rested the sovereignty. Determining to accept the propositions of George Rogers Clark, of Kentucky, for a frontier attack upon New Orleans by way of the Mississippi, he appointed him "Major General of the Independent and Revolutionary Legion of the Mississippi". In July, 1793, Genet made known his plans to Jefferson.² Expecting war with Spain and understanding Genet's proposition to be that of giving freedom to Louisiana and the Floridas, Jefferson made only a formal protest against the implied violation of our neutrality; and he intimated that a little spontaneous uprising in New Orleans might prove to the advantage of the American plans.

Genet's project involved not only the organization of the frontiersmen and the "independent" Indians of the southwest against the Floridas, while George Rogers Clark rallied the Kentuckians against New Orleans, but he proposed to block the mouth of the Mississippi by a French naval force at the same time. It was for this reason that, on July 12, 1793, he so recklessly sent the *Little Democrat* to sea, against the protest of the administration.³ At the same time he made preparations for the use of a fleet against Canada.⁴ It is unnecessary here to relate the misfortunes that befell Genet's projects. His plan of securing an advance on the indebted-

¹ *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I, 311.

² *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 948; *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (ed. Ford), I, 235.

³ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 990.

⁴ For Genet's activity in respect to Canada, see the *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1891, Note D, pp. 57-84. There is considerable material throughout the reports of 1891 and 1894. The connection of Vermonters with this intrigue called out a mass of material; but it is not the purpose of the present paper to discuss the Canadian side of the French activity.

ness due to France by the United States failed. Lacking financial resources, the operations in the interior were delayed, and the use of parts of the fleet was prevented by mutinous crews. Washington prepared to use the military forces of the United States to prevent a violation of our neutrality, and Genet himself lost his following, even among the more radical of the democratic leaders. France, under the Reign of Terror, fully occupied on her own borders and torn by internal party dissension, was unable to carry out her American plans, and Genet was superseded and disavowed.

The new embassy to the United States consisted of Fauchet,¹ as minister plenipotentiary, La Forest,² consul-general, Petry, consul for Pennsylvania, and Le Blanc, secretary of legation. By the terms of the instructions³ given November 25, 1793, no measure which interested the republic could be undertaken without the agreement of a majority of the commissioners. By this it was desired to avoid the indiscretions into which Genet had fallen. The commission, in accordance with these instructions, disavowed the conduct of Genet. By the proclamation of March 6, 1794, Fauchet, not without regret, revoked the commissions of the filibusters and forbade the violation of the neutrality of the United States. But, in spite of the fact that under the Jacobin administration France was ready to disavow the proceedings of the Girondists in respect to the violation of American neutrality, she by no means abandoned her interests in the Mississippi valley. By their instructions the new commissioners were required to inform the officers of the American government

¹ Jean-Antoine-Joseph Fauchet was born in 1761 and died in 1834. He was chief of the bureau of administration of war (1791), secretary of the mayor of Paris (1792), and, in the same year, secretary of the executive power. After his mission to the United States (1794-1795), he became a partizan of Napoleon, and was prefect of the Var and of the Gironde successively. In 1810 he was made a baron. *Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II, 288.

² Antoine-René-Charles-Mathurin de la Forest, son of the Marquis de Paulmy, was born in 1756. He became an attaché in the French legation to the United States in 1778, and was made vice-consul at Savannah in 1783. In 1785 he was charged with the management of the affairs of the *consulat général* in the United States. He replaced Barbé-Marbois in this place March 2, 1792. Recalled November 17, 1792, with the other agents who had served the crown, he desired to remain in America, but finally returned in order to avoid complications between France and the United States. Returning as consul-general with Fauchet, he fell under the suspicion of that minister, and was recalled. On his return to France, he received from Talleyrand the appointment of chief of the *Direction des Fondes*, where he served until 1799. He was connected with the negotiations of the treaty of 1800 with the United States, and also served in the negotiations of the treaty of Lunéville. In 1801 he was minister plenipotentiary at Munich, and was a councilor of state for foreign relations under the Empire. See Masson, *Le Département des Affaires Étrangères pendant la Révolution*, 320, 321, 407-408, 455-464.

³ *Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II, 288-294.

that negotiations with Spain regarding the navigation of the Mississippi would be incompatible with the ties which bound the United States to France. In the earlier part of his mission, Fauchet devoted himself to a policy of "wise delay and useful temporizing", conceiving that the interest of the republic was to obtain from the United States a prolonged inertia. He therefore contented himself with observing the development of our domestic policy, and particularly the events on our frontiers during the period of Indian wars and the Whiskey Rebellion. Of all of this, as well as of the English policy in the northwest, he gave detailed accounts to his government. He was active in sending provision fleets to France, and in protests against English violations of our neutral commerce. At this period other interests were entirely subordinated to the important consideration of the provisioning of France by the United States. The insurrection in the French West Indies gave him concern; but, on the other hand, he pointed out that the revolution of the blacks had established an eternal seed of repulsion between the West Indies and slaveholding America, so that there was less danger of American acquisition of these islands. It was not until the news of Jay's treaty reached him that he turned to the subject of Louisiana. As soon as he was fairly well informed of the purport of this treaty (in February, 1795), he proposed a radical programme for meeting the situation.¹ He reminded his government that he had energetically protested against our failure to enforce the rights of neutral commerce against England; but now Jay's treaty threatened even more unfavorable conditions by its concessions to Great Britain in the matter of neutral rights, and the alliance of 1778 had become worse than useless. Yet, as Fauchet pointed out, France had no means of intimidating the United States. The ocean separated the two powers, and the French West Indies, far from threatening the United States, were actually in danger of starvation in time of war if American trade was cut off. He quoted Jefferson's remark, "France enjoys their sovereignty and we their profit." A war to compel the Union to follow French policy would deprive the republic of the indispensable trade of America. Some other means must be found, and the solution of the problem, in Fauchet's opinion, was the acquisition of a continental colony in America: "Louisiana opens her arms to us." This province would furnish France the best entrepôt in North America, raw material, and a market for her manufactures, a monopoly of the products of the American states

¹ *Ibid.*, Fauchet's despatch of February 4, 1795.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. X.—18.

on the Mississippi, and a means of pressure upon the United States. He predicted that, unless a revolution occurred in Spanish policy, the force of events would unite Louisiana to the United States, and in the course of time would bring about a new confederation between this province and the western states, which would not remain within the United States fifty years. In this new union the superior institutions and power of the American element would give to it the sovereignty. But if France or any power less feeble than Spain possessed Louisiana, it would establish there the sovereignty over all the countries on the Mississippi. If a nation with adequate resources, said he, understood how to manage the control of the river, it could hold in dependence the western states of America, and might at pleasure advance or retard the rate of their growth. What, then, he asks, might not France do with so many warm friends among the Western settlers? The leaven of insurrection had been recently manifested in the Whiskey Rebellion; it would depend upon France to decide the question of dismemberment. In this way, by pressure on our borders, she could bend the United States to her will, or in the possession of the Mississippi valley find a means of freeing herself and her islands from their economic dependence upon the United States. Such was the line of thought presented by Fauchet to the French authorities; he preferred diplomatic negotiation to war or the filibustering system of Genet.

How far this despatch of Fauchet may have affected the policy of France in the negotiations at Basel is not certain, but these negotiations, by which Spain came to terms with France, were exceedingly important for the Mississippi valley. Barthélemy was instructed¹ May 10, 1795, to demand from Spain certain cessions as the price of peace. The Spanish portion of San Domingo, the Basque province of Guipuscoa, and Louisiana were desired, but upon Louisiana he was ordered to insist: "the rest would be easy." "C'est sur la Louisiane qu'il faut insister et le citoyen Barthélemy aura soin de diriger tous ces efforts vers ce but." In support of her demand, France argued that it would be a great gain to Spain to place a strong power between her American possessions and those of the United States, particularly since England had by Jay's treaty guaranteed to the United States the freedom of navigation of the Mississippi, and it was to be feared that these new allies would seize Louisiana.

At this juncture Godoy, the duke of Alcudia, was in control of the foreign policy of Spain. Alarmed by conditions in Europe, and

¹ Sorel, in *Revue Historique*, XIII, 46. See also XII, 295, XIII, 274, and D'Esménard, *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix*.

chagrined at England's arrangements with the United States at a moment when Spain trembled for the fate of Louisiana,¹ he made peace with France at Basel (July, 1795); but he refused to yield Louisiana, preferring to abandon the Spanish portion of San Domingo. This only rendered France the more determined to secure the continental colony needed to support her West Indian possessions; and in the negotiations later over the terms of alliance she pressed hard for the additional cession.

It is this situation which explains the treaty that Godoy made with the United States not long after. He was most reluctant to give up Louisiana, but France demanded it as a condition of her alliance. Threatened thus with isolation, and confronted by the prospect of a war with England, he was disposed to conciliate the United States, lest she join England and take Louisiana by force. When, therefore, Pinckney's threat to leave for London was made, Godoy interpreted it as an indication that Jay's treaty had made contingent provision for a joint attack by England and the United States against Louisiana. He had previously tried in vain to persuade Pinckney to engage the United States in an alliance with France and Spain. In alarm he hastily came to the American terms, and in the treaty of San Lorenzo (October 27, 1795)² he conceded the navigation of the Mississippi and our boundary on that river, and agreed to give up the Spanish posts north of New Orleans within the disputed territory. Thus relieved of the danger of an American invasion, Godoy was in a better position to resist the efforts of France to force him to cede Louisiana.

By the close of the year 1795, therefore, Washington's administration had by Jay's treaty secured possession of the northwest, and by Pinckney's treaty had received the promise of the evacuation of the disputed posts on the east of the Mississippi by Spain. The flanks of the Mississippi valley were apparently insured to the United States. But the former diplomatic conditions were reversed after Jay's treaty and the treaty of Basel. France and Spain were no longer enemies. Spain had broken with England; and the United States, swinging away from the French alliance, was embracing the friendship of England. To Spain and France there seemed to be a menace, in these new relationships, against the Spanish-American

¹ In a letter of December 29, 1794, Short informed the Secretary of State of Godoy's mortification at Jay's treaty and of his bitterness against England. Godoy intimated that the points for a treaty between the United States and Spain might easily be arranged. Nevertheless he continued to procrastinate. See Morrissey, "William Short's Career" (Cornell, Thesis, MS., 1900, p. 530).

² D'Esménard, *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix*, II, ch. xxx (part i).

colonies. It became a cardinal point in French policy, therefore, to press to a conclusion the negotiations for Louisiana, to suspend diplomatic relations with the United States, and to attempt to alarm her into a reversal of her friendly attitude toward England. But it was not the policy of France to force the United States into war. Adet,¹ who arrived as the successor of Fauchet in June, 1795, later informed his government that a rupture with the United States would be a disadvantage for France:

"You know that our colonies would be without provisionment and perhaps actually conquered, that all hope of commerce with America would be cut off thereafter, while England would receive 30,000 sailors of the United States, and Louisiana and the Floridas would shortly fall under the power of our new enemies and of Great Britain; that New Mexico would soon see their banners waving, and who knows where the habit of pillage and the ambition of conquest may conduct them in a country so badly defended as the Spanish possessions and where already germs of discord exist and the ferment of discontent?"²

The treaty of Basel had provided for peace between France and Spain, but it did not include the terms of an alliance. France now tried to reap the fruits of her success by dictating the conditions of the treaty. In the spring of 1796, the Directors sent General Perignon to Madrid to arrange terms of a formal alliance.³ He was instructed to warn Spain that French influence in America was nearing its end. War with the United States promised France no satisfactory results, and to punish the Americans by restrictions on their commerce would deprive France of a resource which the European wars rendered necessary to her. These, however, were merely temporary difficulties. "Who", asked the Directors, "can answer that England and the United States together will not divide up the northern part of the New World? What prevents them?" The instructions went on to give a forceful presentation of the rapidity with which settlers were pouring into Kentucky and Tennessee, and of the danger to Louisiana from filibustering expeditions. The concession of the navigation of the Mississippi, in the opinion of France, pre-

¹ Pierre-Auguste Adet was born in Paris in 1763. He was the author of some important chemical works, was the secretary of the first commission sent to San Domingo; then *chef de l'administration des colonies*, and afterward connected with the ministry of marine. He served for a time in Geneva, whence he was transferred to the United States. Adet's instructions and correspondence are in the *Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II.

² Adet's despatch of February 3, 1797, *ibid.*

³ See the instructions in *Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, 667-671; *Atlantic Monthly*, XCIII, 810.

pared the ruin and invasion of Louisiana whenever the United States, in concert with Great Britain, should "give the reins to those fierce inhabitants of the West". The English-speaking people would then overrun Mexico and all North America, and the commerce of the islands of the Gulf would be dependent upon this Anglo-American power. Only France, in alliance with Spain, argued the Directors, can oppose a counterpoise, by the use of her old influence among the Indians: "We alone can trace with strong and respected hand the bounds of the power of the United States and the limits of their territory." All that France demanded was Louisiana, a province that, so far from serving the purpose of its original cession as a barrier against England, was now a dangerous possession to Spain, ever ready to join with her neighbors. It had remained in a condition of infancy while the United States had acquired irresistible strength on its borders. This country was now daily preparing the subjects of Spain for insurrection by intrigues and by the spectacle of its prosperity. "On the other hand," continued the Directors, "if this possession were once in our hands, it would be beyond insult by Great Britain, to whom we can oppose not only the western settlements of the United States, who are as friendly to us as they could possibly be, but also the inhabitants of Louisiana, who have given clear evidence of their indestructible attachment to their former mother-country. It gives us the means to balance the marked predilection of the federal government for our enemy, and to retain it in the line of duty by the fear of dismemberment which we can bring about." "We shall affright England by the sudden development of an actual power in the New World, and shall be in a position to oppose a perfect harmony to her attacks and her intrigues." They therefore urged Spain to act at once, in order that the political and military campaigns might begin in America that very year.

But Godoy resolutely refused to give up Louisiana, and Perignon was obliged to content himself with a treaty of alliance without this important concession. France thereupon recalled him, and sent a successor with the particular purpose of persuading Spain to yield Louisiana by the offer to join her in the conquest of Portugal; but the Prince of Peace remained immovable; nor did he consent even when, in 1797, after Napoleon's victories in Italy had given the papal legations to France, she offered them to the royal house of Spain as an equivalent for Louisiana. Had religious scruples not prevented, however, Spain would probably have accepted this proposition.¹

¹ See Sorel's study of the relations of France and Spain, 1792-1797, in *Revue Historique*, XIII, 46, 274; and *Mémoires du Prince de la Paix*, III, 116; Barras, *Memoirs* (New York, 1895), II, 359.

While France negotiated with Spain, she prepared the ground in America. In the winter of 1795, Colonel Fulton, one of George Rogers Clark's officers in the Genet expedition, was sent to intrigue with the southwestern Indians¹ and to consult with Clark.

By the close of 1796 Fulton, having returned, furnished the Directors information as to the best season for occupying Louisiana, and assured them that Clark's old soldiers were loyal to France,

¹ See *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 463; *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 1063, and index under "Fulton". Samuel Fulton was one of the interesting American adventurers of the type of Tate. He was a North Carolinian who removed to the Creek country about 1791. Refusing to swear allegiance to the king of Spain, he was forced to leave in 1793. The spring of 1794 found him acting as an assistant to George Rogers Clark in the service of France, with the position of major of cavalry. After the failure of the expedition he went to Paris to collect the claims of Clark and himself against the French government. Here he was commissioned as colonel in the cavalry, but he writes, "I begin to be D—d tired of Paris." In the summer of 1795 he was back in the United States and was sent by the minister, Adet, to report on the situation of the followers of Elijah Clarke, who had fled to Amelia Island after the failure of the Genet project in which they had a part. Adet regretted that the peace of Basel compelled him to withdraw French support from this promising movement against the Spanish possessions (*Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, 663). Fulton then went to Kentucky some time prior to November 2, 1795, to inform George Rogers Clark that the French government ratified the proceedings of Genet and himself (*ibid.*, 1896, I, 1095). Colonel Charles M. Thruston wrote to his son Charles at Louisville under date of Frederick Co., Va., February 17, 1796: "We have a report here that Col. Fulton has returned from France with a commission for Genl. Clark of Major General in the French service, with an appointment of three hundred dollars a month for him and commissions for all his officers. If this be true it must have reached you before this; and if it be so, I beg you, present my congratulations to the General, and my best respects. For his country has been ungrateful enough to let his valuable services pass by unregarded and neglected" (Draper MSS., Trip, 1868, IV, 223). Chisholm, who was connected with Blount's conspiracy, informs us (in Declaration of November 29, 1797, State Dept. MSS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches, England, vol. 5, no. 57) that in the winter of 1795, he met, between the towns of the Creeks and the Cherokee Nations, a person named Fulton, who said he was a colonel of horse in the French service. "He told me", says Chisholm, "that he had come from France in order to get the Indians consent for the establishment of a Republic in the Floridas, as they the French were to take it, or to get it (I don't recollect which) from the Spaniards; as I was friendly to the United States I advised him to leave the country as soon as possible which I believe he did as I have not heard of him since; the said Fulton is a tall handsome man upwards of six feet high, well mounted and handsomely equipped in every particular, appeared to be about twenty-five years of age." Fulton arrived in Philadelphia in the middle of March, after his long and disagreeable journey (*Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 1098), and returned again to France bearing Adet's despatches about April 19, 1796 (Affaires Étrangères, É.-U. Corresp. vol. 45, fo. 378). In a letter of George Rogers Clark to Fulton, dated March 2, 1797, he refers to a letter from Fulton of "last December" enclosing copies of patents of general of brigade accorded to Clark by the Directory (Baron Marc de Villiers du Terrage, *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française*, 362). On May 26, 1797, Delacroix, minister of foreign relations, refers to the granting of a commission to George Rogers Clark as general of brigade without activity, and says: "It is not indifferent to our interests to preserve among these people and the men who have their confidence, all the dispositions which are favorable to us." Affaires Étrangères, États-Unis, vol. 47, fo. 305.

and asked only arms, ammunition, and uniforms, and "their country will find itself in the vast regions which the Republic will possess".¹ Toward the end of 1796, France sent a new commission to George Rogers Clark, as brigadier-general, on the theory, as Delacroix, the minister of foreign relations, declared, that it was to the interest of France to foster a favorable disposition among the Westerners. "In case we shall be put in possession of Louisiana," he wrote, "the affection of those regions will serve us in our political plans toward the United States."²

Information regarding the southwestern tribes was also procured from Milfort, a French adventurer who, after passing twenty years among the Creeks as an agent of Spain, went to offer his services to France.³ He had married a sister of McGillivray, and claimed to be the principal war-chief of the Creeks. In 1795 Milfort had left the Indians and had presented his plans for organizing the Indians of the southwest under the French, and, according to his statement, Fauchet approved them. He was put off in Paris by the fact that France was negotiating with Spain, but the Directory took him up, and on March 26, 1796, gave him the title of general of brigade. In 1798 he presented a memoir to the Directory offering them a large portion of Creek territory by which they might destroy the Americans and facilitate the acquisition of Louisiana. The matter was favorably received by Talleyrand.

Not only did France again draw together the threads of intrigue with the "independent" Indians and the frontiersmen, but also in the summer of 1796 she determined to send Mangourit to America to replace Adet.⁴ Monroe reported rumors that France was to make an attempt upon Canada, "which is to be united with Louisiana and the Floridas to the south, taking in such parts of our western people as are willing to unite". Monroe's protest against Mangourit's appointment was effective; but the significance of the selec-

¹ Fulton to Delacroix, October 24, 1796. *Affaires Étrangères, La. et Fla.*, vol. 7, fo. 44.

² *Ibid.*, États-Unis, vol. 47, fo. 305.

³ His *Mémoire ou Coup d'œil Rapide sur mes Différens Voyages et mon Séjour dans la Nation Crèck* is one of the sources for our knowledge of these Indians; but he was a hopeless liar, one of his most interesting concoctions being a statement to the French government that he had defeated ten thousand regulars under George Rogers Clark near Detroit by a force of six thousand Northern Indians under his command (De Villiers du Terrage, *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française*, 364). For his career, see in addition to his *Mémoire*, the *State Papers and Correspondence bearing upon the Purchase of the Territory of Louisiana*, 20; *American State Papers, Indian Affairs*, I, 395; Pickett, *Alabama* (1851 ed.), I, 115 ff.; *Report of American Historical Association*, 1896, I, 1053.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1903, II, gives the draft of his instructions. See also *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I, 742.

tion of this energetic companion of Genet in the early attempt upon Louisiana and Florida is obvious.

In the meantime Adet, the French minister to the United States, exerted every effort to prevent Congress from voting the appropriations to carry out Jay's treaty. In fact, as it turned out, the vote was a close one, but Adet, foreseeing defeat, and acting in accordance with the desire of his government, in March, 1796, commissioned General Victor Collot,¹ formerly governor of Guadeloupe, to travel in the west, and to make a military survey of the defenses and lines of communication west of the Alleghenies, along the Ohio and the Mississippi. Collot was gone about ten months, and as he passed down the rivers he pointed out to men whom he trusted the advantages of accepting French jurisdiction. He made detailed and accurate plans of the river-courses and the Spanish posts, which may still be seen in the atlas that accompanies his *Journey in North America*, published long afterward. As the military expert on whose judgment the French government had to rely, his conclusions have a peculiar interest, and may be given in his own words: "All the positions on the left bank of the river [Mississippi], in whatever point of view they may be considered, or in whatever mode they may be occupied, without the alliance of the Western states are far from covering Louisiana: they are, on the contrary, highly injurious to this colony; and the money and men which might be employed for this purpose would be ineffectual." In other words, a Louisiana bounded by the Mississippi could not be protected against the neighboring settlements of the United States. He emphasizes the same idea, in another connection, as follows: "When two nations possess, one the coasts and the other the plains, the former must inevitably embark or submit. From thence I conclude that the Western states of the North American republic must unite themselves with Louisiana and form in the future one single compact nation; else that colony to whatever power it shall belong will be conquered or devoured."

As the logical accompaniment of this conclusion that Louisiana must embrace the western states, Collot drew up a plan for the de-

¹ For Adet's policy in this period and his relations with Collot, see *Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II. Collot's report is in print in part: Collot, *Voyage dans l'Amérique Septentrionale . . . avec un Atlas de 36 Cartes* (2 vols., Paris, 1826), and in English: *Journey in North America* (Paris, 1826), also with the atlas. The *Portfolio*, Jan. 28, 1804, p. 30, published a prospectus of the work. See also Gibbs, *Memoirs* (1846), 350, *et passim*; Smith, *St. Clair Papers*, II, 395; Jefferson, *Works* (1854), IX, 200; Gayarré, *Louisiana*, III, 383; Cruzat, in *New Orleans Picayune*, March 18, 1901; *Michigan Pioneer Collections*, XXV, 171; *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1891; Pickering Papers indexed in *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, Sixth Series, VIII, 44, *et passim*.

fense of the passes of the Alleghenies, which were to constitute the frontier of this interior dependency of France to protect it against the United States. The Louisiana that Collot contemplated, therefore, stretched from the Alleghenies to the Rockies.¹ The importance of his report is made clearer by the facts that the minister Adet, and the consul-general who remained after he left, continually refer to Collot's work as the basis for their views on Louisiana, and that Livingston reported in 1802 that it had been expected that Napoleon would make Collot second in command in the province of Louisiana, and that Adet was to be prefect.²

As he descended the Mississippi, Collot learned of a plot for an attack under the English flag upon the Spanish dependencies, and on his return, early in 1797, he notified the Spanish minister to the United States, who promptly informed the secretary of state. In the investigation that followed, it was ascertained that the British minister had been privy to the plans, and United States Senator Blount, of Tennessee, lost his seat as a result of the revelations which involved him. The incident revealed how wide-spread were the forces of intrigue for the Mississippi valley, and it gave grounds for the refusal of the Spanish authorities to carry out the agreement to yield their posts on the right bank of the river while New Orleans was threatened by an attack down the Mississippi.

The documentary material for the Blount episode will be published in a later number of the REVIEW. Here its lines can be hardly more than indicated.³ On October 24, 1795, the English government had charged Lieutenant-Governor Simcoe, of Canada, to cultivate such intercourse with the leading men of the western settlements of the United States as would enable England to utilize the services of the frontiersmen against the Spanish settlements, if war broke out between England and Spain, and to report what assistance might be

¹ In view of these designs, there is significance in the Farewell Address, which Washington issued while Collot was making his investigations. Washington informed the West that "it must, of necessity, owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as one nation. Any other tenure by which the *West* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength, or from an apostate and unnatural connexion with any foreign Power, must be intrinsically precarious." He added that the treaties with Spain and England had given the Western people all that they could desire in respect to foreign relations, and asked: "Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? Will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such there are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?" *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, I, 34-38.

² *State Papers and Correspondence bearing upon the Purchase of the Territory of Louisiana* (Washington, 1903), 29.

³ See *Atlantic Monthly*, XCIII, 813.

afforded by the Southern and Western Indians in such an event. Information was also desired with regard to the communications between Lake Michigan and the Mississippi, with the evident idea of using Canadian forces in the operations. These "most private and secret" instructions¹ cast light upon England's policy at this time, and the explicit injunctions of caution, lest the government should be compromised with Spain and the United States while matters were preparing, help us to understand that whatever was to be done must be managed secretly. War was declared by Spain against England in the fall of 1796, and rumors of the approaching acquisition of Louisiana by France alarmed the land-speculators like Blount, as well as the former Tory settlers about Natchez. The gist of the plan with which Blount's name is connected was that a combined body of frontiersmen and Indians, working in concert with the English fleet and an expedition from Canada, should seize Louisiana and the Floridas for England. Liston, the minister, was acquainted with the essential features of the plan, canvassed the practicability of Canadian assistance with the authorities of that province, and finally communicated the matter to his government. In the meantime it had become known, and England disavowed responsibility.²

¹ British War Office (Colonial) Secret Entry Book and *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1891, "Upper Canada", 59.

² On the whole matter see the following: Collot, *Journey in North America*, II, 11, 64, 65, 229; Aff. Ét., États-Unis, vol. 47, folios 124, 126, 130, 137; *American State Papers, Foreign Relations*, II, 66 ff.; *Annals of Fifth Congress, 1797-1799*, 498, 2245 ff., 3131 ff.; King's *Correspondence of King*, II, 195-199, 208, 209, 216-218, 236, 253-256, 258. The disclosures to King made by Chisholm are in the Department of State, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches, England, vols. 4 and 5, and also in the King MSS. in the New York Historical Society, folio A, 378, 385, 386, 391. See also the British Public Record Office, America, XVIII (containing Liston's correspondence on the subject); *Report on Canadian Archives*, 1891, "Upper Canada", 71, 77, and "Lower Canada", 149, *et passim*; *Michigan Pioneer Collections*, XXIV, 666, XXV, 27; *Massachusetts Historical Collections*, Sixth Series, VIII, 44, *et passim* (Pickering Papers); Upham's *Pickering*; Gibbs, *Memoirs of the Administrations of Washington and Adams*, I, 474, *et passim*; Roosevelt, *Winning of the West*, I, p. xi (citing the Blount MSS., sent him by the Honorable W. D. Stephens, of Los Angeles, California), IV, 212 and index, *s. v.* Blount; M. J. Wright, *Life and Services of William Blount*; Riley, "Spanish Policy in Mississippi after the Treaty of San Lorenzo", in *Report of American Historical Association*, 1897, 177; Hinsdale, "Southern Boundary of the United States", *ibid.*, 1893, 331; Gayarré, *History of Louisiana*, III; Marbois, *History of Louisiana* (1830), 163-165; Winsor, *Westward Movement*, 561-573.

General George Rogers Clark, of Kentucky, wrote on March 2, 1797, to his old companion in the Genet expedition, Colonel Fulton, then in the service of the Directory of France: "We have here English agents from Canada to enrol volunteers destined to march against Louisiana. Some days ago I received propositions from the governor of Canada to march at the head of two thousand men against the Spanish establishments of New Mexico." The plan, he explains, was to occupy St. Louis, then to divide the army; one party would descend the Mississippi and the other march upon Santa Fé. Terrage, *Les Dernières Années de la Louisiane Française*, 362-363.

From the point of view of the larger diplomatic problem, the most tangible result of the affair was the retention by Spain of Natchez and the other posts east of the Mississippi, under the sincere apprehension that if they were evacuated, in accordance with the treaty of 1795, a clear road would be opened for the British into Louisiana. Not until the spring of 1798 did Spain, under the anti-French policy of Godoy, actually evacuate these forts.¹

After the rupture of diplomatic relations with France the Federalists proceeded in the early summer of 1797 to enact laws for raising an army and providing a fleet, and for the necessary loans and taxes in preparation for war with the republic. But, less radical than some of his advisers, and ready to make another effort to adjust our affairs with France, President Adams sent a commission to reopen negotiations, in spite of his chagrin that the previous minister, C. C. Pinckney, had been summarily refused and ordered out of France.

When this commission sailed, Talleyrand had just become the master of the foreign policy of his country. He had returned from his sojourn in the United States, convinced that Americans were hopelessly attached to England,² and that France must have Louisiana. In a memoir to the Institute, April 4, 1797, he had pointed out that Louisiana would serve the commercial needs of France, would prove a granary for a great West Indian colonial power, and would be a useful outlet for the discontented revolutionists, who could find room for their energies in building up the New World.³ It was his policy to play with the American representatives, refusing to deal with them except informally through agents; and, while detaining them, to negotiate with Spain for Louisiana. These so-called X. Y. Z. negotiations

¹ See Henry Adams's account of Godoy's relation to this action and of his loss of power under French influence (*History of the United States*, I, 350-351).

² See his letter to Lord Lansdowne, 1795, in *Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique*, III, 64-77, and his *Memoir concerning the Commercial Relations of the United States with England*, etc., London, 1806. The French original I have not seen (*Recueil des Mémoires de l'Institut*, 1st series, II, 1799). Cf. Talleyrand's *Memoirs* (New York, 1891), I, 188.

³ There were many French travelers who visited the United States and described the Mississippi valley between 1790 and 1803. See *Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II (introduction). In 1798 Dupont de Nemours and some other French philosophers, a delegation from the National Institute, had applied through Sir Joseph Banks for passports from the English government, the Directory having given them passports to go to the United States with a view to improve and extend the sciences. Mr. King, the American minister, wrote that he understood that the object of the mission was to form an establishment high up the Mississippi, out of the limits of the United States, and within the boundaries of Spain. President Adams agreed with Mr. King that no encouragement should be given to this mission. Adams, *Works*, VIII, 596. The possible connection with the political designs of France is obvious. Compare Michaux's Journal (Thwaites, *Early Western Travels*, III, 53, 89, 90).

extended till the spring of 1798, when Marshall and Pinckney, outraged by demands for bribes and hopeless of results, left Paris. Gerry, deluded by Talleyrand, remained to keep the peace, and while the adroit diplomat deceived Gerry, he instructed Guillemardet, his minister at Madrid, to make Spain realize that that government had been blind to its interests in putting the United States into possession of the Mississippi forts; they meant, he declared, to rule alone in America, and to influence Europe. No other means existed for putting an end to their ambition than that of "shutting them up within the limits which Nature seems to have traced for them". There can be little doubt that Talleyrand intended the Alleghenies by this expression. France, he argued, if placed in possession of Louisiana and Florida, would be a "wall of brass forever impenetrable to the combined efforts of England and America".¹ In a memoir of July 10, 1798, Talleyrand reported to the Directory the yielding spirit of Spain and her increasing favor toward the plan of having French troops, rather than Spanish, meet the expected invasion of Louisiana by England and the United States. In the course of a discussion of the policy to be adopted toward Portugal, the minister proposed an exchange of some of the provinces of that country for Louisiana.² Thus Talleyrand increased his aggressive policy toward the Spanish peninsula and Spain's North American dependencies immediately after the retirement of Godoy and contemporaneously with the policy of deceiving the United States into inactivity. Spain and her provinces bid fair to become appanages of France.

The situation led Pitt to consider again the proposition³ to revolutionize Spanish America, with the coöperation of the United States. Again Miranda raised the veil of the future and summoned England and the United States to give freedom to the colonies of Spain, complete the passage of the Isthmus of Panama by a waterway, and

¹ H. Adams, *History of the United States*, I, 355 ff.

² Pallain, *Le Ministère de Talleyrand sous le Directoire*, 312.

³ *Atlantic Monthly*, XCIII, 815. The despatches of the American minister to England, Rufus King, during the early months of 1798 show that Grenville and Pitt seriously contemplated freeing the Spanish-American colonies by joint operations on the part of England and the United States, in case Spain fell completely under French control. King embraced the project eagerly. Hamilton's connection with the matter, as effective head of the American army, is an interesting feature. The episode has its importance for the present discussion, in showing how closely Spanish-American matters were involved in the Louisiana question; how certain it was that the United States would be involved in the European alliances so long as the fate of the Mississippi valley was uncertain; and how Jefferson's project of combining with England in case France occupied New Orleans was prefigured in this Federalist negotiation. See King, *Correspondence*, II, 278, 283, 305, 367, 392, 453, 454, 511, 519, 650, 654, 657. The works of Adams and Hamilton should also be consulted.

enter into the commerce of the New World. But John Adams proved stubborn in his refusal. Pitt finally determined to await events and see whether Spain could resist incorporation in the French power.

So it was that Napoleon found Louisiana ripe for the picking in 1800. His plan of taking possession was on the same lines as were the plans of those who guided the Louisiana policy of France before him. In his instructions to the captain-general¹ in 1802, he referred to the fact that as the mistress of both banks of the Mississippi at its mouth, France held the key to its navigation—a matter of the highest importance to the western states. “Whatever may be the events which this new part of the continent has to expect, the arrival of the French forces should be marked there by the expression of sentiments of great benevolence for these new neighbors.” These were not reassuring words! But the rest was more alarming: “A little local experience will soon enable you to discern the sentiments of the western provinces of the Federal Government. It will be well to maintain sources of intelligence in that country, whose numerous, warlike, and sober population may present you a redoubtable enemy. The inhabitants of Kentucky especially should fix the attention of the captain-general. . . . He must also fortify himself against them by alliance with the Indian nations scattered to the east of the river.”

It is reasonably clear that Napoleon’s policy resembled that of Vergennes. He would intrigue with the Westerners, use the control of the navigation to influence them, make of the Indians a barrier, and gradually widen the borders of his province until the Gulf of Mexico should be a French lake, and perhaps the Alleghenies the boundary of the United States. Lord Hawkesbury, the English minister of foreign affairs, saw the danger and warned Rufus King in 1801 that “the acquisition might enable France to extend her influence and perhaps her dominion up the Mississippi and through the Great Lakes, even to Canada. This would be realizing the plan, to prevent the accomplishment of which the Seven Years’ War took place.”

But Lord Hawkesbury saw it no more clearly than did Thomas Jefferson, who had turned his attention to the west ever since he encouraged George Rogers Clark to go forth from Virginia and conquer the Illinois country in the Revolution. He had learned the truth that the possession of New Orleans by any European power meant that the United States would essentially be a part of Europe. “The day that France takes possession of New Orleans,” he

¹ H. Adams, *History of the United States*, II, 8, 9.

wrote,¹ "fixes the sentence which is to restrain her forever within her low-water mark. It seals the union of two nations, who, in conjunction, can maintain exclusive possession of the ocean. From that moment, we must marry ourselves to the British fleet and nation. We must turn all our attention to a maritime force, for which our resources place us on very high ground; and having formed and connected together a power which may render reinforcement of her settlements here impossible to France, make the first cannon which shall be fired in Europe the signal for the tearing up any settlement she may have made, and for holding the two continents of America in sequestration for the common purposes of the United British and American nations."²

It is evident that the policy of Vergennes found supporters in the subsequent French governments. Even under the Bourbons, De Moustier, the minister to the United States, urged the reacquisition of Louisiana. In the beginning of the French Revolution, the French government first proposed to unite with England in dividing Spanish America, and then the Girondists sent Genet to conquer Louisiana and the Floridas by the aid of the trans-Allegheny settlers. His successor urged the recovery of the province by diplomacy, and France made strenuous efforts at Basel in 1795 and in the negotiations over alliance with Spain under the Directory in 1796 to procure its restitution. Her military expert advised an Allegheny frontier for Louisiana, and, as the prospect of war between France and the United States grew imminent, in 1796 the republic renewed the commission of George Rogers Clark and other Americans and expected aid from the frontiersmen. From that time until Napoleon's power reduced Spain to essential vassalage and forced the cession of Louisiana, hardly a year elapsed in which France did not make an effort to secure that province and the Floridas. She proposed to use the ascendancy which she would possess over the river and the Gulf to force the United States to

¹ Jefferson's *Works* (ed. H. A. Washington, 1853-1854), IV, 432.

² When the French minister Adet was striving to secure the election of Jefferson to the presidency in 1796, he reported to his government this estimate of Jefferson's character: "I do not know whether, as I am told, we will always find in him a man entirely devoted to our interests. Mr. Jefferson likes us because he detests England; he seeks to unite with us because he suspects us less than Great Britain, but he would change his sentiments toward us to-morrow, perhaps, if to-morrow Great Britain ceased to inspire him with fear. Jefferson, although a friend of liberty and the sciences, although an admirer of the efforts which we have made to break our chains and dissipate the cloud of ignorance which weighs upon mankind, Jefferson, I say, is an American, and, by that title, it is impossible for him to be sincerely our friend. An American is the born enemy of European peoples" (Adet's despatch of 1796, *Report of American Historical Association*, 1903, II).

become her servile ally, or to lose the west by reason of French pressure upon the frontiersmen. The language of Talleyrand indicates his belief that the Alleghenies were the natural boundary for the United States. Napoleon's Louisiana policy was, therefore, simply the continuation of a long series of consistent attempts by the French government.

Through the whole period France relied upon the friendship of the frontiersmen and upon negotiations with the "independent Indian tribes" of the southwest to further her plans for dominating the trans-Allegheny region.

The real question at issue was whether the control of the entire Mississippi valley and the Gulf of Mexico should fall to France, England, or the United States. In view of Spain's decline, the fate of Spanish America hinged upon the decision. The contest abundantly illustrates the fact that a river is not a barrier, and consequently not a permanent boundary. No one who has studied the evidence of long-continued menace to the connection of the west with the rest of the United States made by the Alleghenies¹ prior to the railroads, can doubt that the danger was a real one, and that a European power might have arisen along the Mississippi valley and the Gulf of Mexico, dominating the interior by its naval force, and checking, if not preventing, the destiny of the United States as the arbiter of North America and the protector of an American system for the New World.

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER.

¹ This danger was increased, owing to the indifference, and, at times, the antagonism of the northeastern commercial section to the trans-Allegheny lands.

IMPROVISING A GOVERNMENT IN PARIS IN JULY, 1789

ALTHOUGH the dominant influence which Paris exerted upon the course of the French Revolution never has been doubted, its nature has often been misconceived. Sometimes it is taken to mean the coercion or overthrow of the government by such uprisings as those of July and October, 1789, or the dictatorship of the insurrectionary communes of August, 1792, and of June, 1793. Even if the influence of Paris were so restricted and episodic, it would be instructive to indicate exactly the relation of such popular movements to the administration of the city itself and to learn whether the appearance at the Hôtel de Ville, August 10, 1792, or May 31, 1793, of a new set of delegates from the sections, superseding the existing administration, was a peculiarly Jacobinical device or was a characteristic feature of local political methods. The more one studies the politics of Paris in the early period of the Revolution, the less one is inclined to believe that the Jacobins were inventors, or that universal suffrage, introduced August 10, was responsible for party violence in 1793. It also seems beyond dispute that the spirit of domination which rendered Paris responsible for the excesses of the Terror was present in 1789, although checked at that time by the provisional government of the city and veiled under polite phrases of reverence for the decrees of the National Assembly and the person of the king. For these reasons there is no source from which new light upon the Revolution is more likely to come than from the records of the first provisional assemblies of Paris, those chosen to act for the city as a whole and those which brought together separately the voters of each of the sixty districts.

The subject has also an interest of its own. Not until October 9, 1790, was the new municipality definitively organized. Consequently for considerably more than a year after the collapse of the old government the city was under the control of an administration of which the separate parts were improvised, at first from day to day, and, until the middle of November, 1789, exposed to sudden and violent change. Quite apart from any influence Paris then exerted upon the Revolution, the period offers two features of almost equal interest—the actual construction of a provisional administra-

tion amidst the ruins of old institutions and the political controversies which agitated the people as long as the nature of the new government was not finally settled. The spectacle of a great community—the population of Paris was toward 680,000—passing suddenly from one régime to another, the first almost totally destroyed in a day and the second in no sense an outgrowth of it, must always awaken curiosity. And it is not the fighting in the streets or the revolting murders, characteristic of popular convulsions, that provoke this curiosity, it is rather the spirit and manner in which men came forward to reorganize their affairs and to master a difficult situation. The interest is heightened by the fact that these men possessed little political experience, although many of them were of great intelligence and high standing in the community. The first phase of this effort, which ended when the “electors” gave place late in July, 1789, to the “Assembly of the Representatives of the Commune”, is the subject of the present article.

I.

To comprehend the difficulty of the task that suddenly confronted the Parisians on the twelfth and thirteenth of July it is necessary to know something of the administrative system which practically disappeared in the face of insurrection. Unhappily that system was so complex—as complex as the old régime—that only the more characteristic features can be indicated.¹ Not many great names are associated in the popular imagination with the old city organization. The one generally remembered is Étienne Marcel, provost of the merchants. His strong and tragic figure evokes the illusion of a centralized government controlled by one official. In 1789 there was still a provost of the merchants, but he was far from possessing an effective jurisdiction throughout the city. Of the various powers which did share the government the most important was the lieutenant-general of the police, who stood in much the same relation to Paris as did the intendants to the “generalities”. These intendants, it will be remembered, carried out the will of the central government, and were able to act within certain limits on their own authority. Nominally the head of the police was simply another lieutenant added to the four magistrates who presided at the Châtelet. He was therefore subordinate to the provost of Paris,

¹ The general history of Paris is briefly recounted by Fernand Bournon in *Paris, Histoire, Monuments, Administration*, etc., Paris, 1888; also by H. de Pontich in the introductory portion of his *Administration de la Ville de Paris*, Paris, 1884. For a general description of the city in 1789 see H. Monin, *L'État de Paris en 1789, Études et Documents*, 1889.

who had his seat at the Châtelet but whose office, like that of the governor of Paris, had become a sinecure. The addition of a lieutenant-general of police introduced an incongruous element into the Châtelet, which was an ancient court second in dignity only to the Parlement of Paris, for he was rather an administrator than a judge. As an administrator he was immediately dependent upon the minister of the *maison du roi*, to whose department Paris was assigned. The scope of his functions appears clearly in the distribution of work among his ten bureaux.¹ It would be difficult to find a subject of administration which is not included, except those matters which touched the Seine, the river trade, the quays and bridges, and the ramparts. As head of the police he had also under him forty-eight commissioners, and an inspector for each of the twenty quarters of the city, besides detectives and informers "secretly employed and paid according to their works". Although his force was small, it was supported by the guards of the city, particularly the watch and the famous regiment of the *gardes-françaises*. But the lieutenant-general was something more than a judge, an administrator, and head of the police; it was his duty to issue ordinances, similar to those commonly passed by American municipal assemblies. These ordinances were administrative in character and were intended to carry into effect existing royal decrees.²

Although the Hôtel de Ville possessed less power than that which the Châtelet exercised through the lieutenant-general, it was the place where dwelt great traditions and toward which were turned hopes for a time when the name commune would be transformed into a political reality. The *bureau de la ville* was composed of the provost of the merchants, four aldermen, a secretary, a treasurer, and a law-officer, the *procureur du roi de la ville*. There were also twenty-four councilors, although no council in the proper sense of the word, and sixteen officers of quarters, with their subordinates. These minor officials existed in theory more than in fact, and their names and functions served as a mute protest against the encroachments of the police. The attitude of ineffective defense is also signalized in the obstinate refusal to abandon the division into sixteen quarters and adopt a division into twenty provided in the police organization. The peculiar province of the Hôtel de Ville was the river trade and everything that concerned it. It shared

¹ See *Almanach Royal de 1789*, 423-427. Cf. Monin, *op. cit.*, 399-402.

² Such ordinances were registered by the Châtelet, and generally by Parlement also, in order that cases arising under them might be prosecuted in the courts and carried up on appeal. Not infrequently Parlement succeeded by protest in modifying such legislation, whether it was due to the lieutenant-general himself or whether he was simply the instrument by which it was transmitted.

with the lieutenant-general the duty of making arrangements for furnishing the city with an adequate supply of food. For this purpose its authority extended over the Seine and the rivers which flowed into the Seine. As both Paris and the generality of Paris were under the minister of the *maison du roi*, the relation of the city to the surrounding country was not simply that of being the best market. This relation is implied in the law which forbade speculators to buy wheat within ten leagues, a feature of the old régime which showed a strong tendency to persist even after the July revolution.

In filling the positions of provost and aldermen there was an elaborate semblance of election. The provost was actually nominated by the king, but each year two aldermen were chosen by a body composed partly of officials, partly of notable bourgeois subjected to a double sifting process. Almost the only valuable opportunity of gaining experience in conducting business in public assemblies was offered by the *fabriques* or parish organizations. Here for the election of a responsible churchwarden, and to pass upon the accounts of the retiring churchwarden, two general assemblies were held each year. In order to vote in these assemblies it was necessary to be rated on the tax list for at least six livres. The fact that the parishes were the only schools training men for united action might, but for their inequality of population, have made of them the natural subdivisions of the municipality when the revolution of July took place.

II.

The beginnings of a new order of things were made half unconsciously during the elections to the States-General. The machinery designed to provide for the choice of the deputies of the Third Estate was to survive its original purpose and not only to bear for a time the burden of administration, but in a measure to control the lines on which the new provisional government was constructed.

Before the method of election was arranged in detail, an attempt was made to bring together the electors of the three orders in a single assembly. The most urgent champions of this plan were the officials of the Hôtel de Ville, according to whom "ecclesiastics, nobles, plebeians, were all collectively included in the title Bourgeois de Paris". Their special purpose was to secure for the provost of the merchants and the *bureau de la ville* the honor of conducting the elections, an honor to which the Châtelet and the provost of Paris also laid claim. The decision of the government in favor of the Châtelet caused the resignation of the provost of the merchants,

Le Peletier de Morfontaine. The vacancy was filled by the appointment of Jacques de Flesselles, destined to be one of the victims of the July revolution. This decision did not, however, lead to an immediate abandonment of the plan of coöperation. The nobles themselves began to urge it. Just before the primary assemblies were held they met and voted to send to the district assemblies of the Third Estate a protest "in favor of the preservation of the commune and of the right to form a single body, a right which the citizens of all orders of the Ville de Paris have always enjoyed". Probably the nobles would have been unwilling to be treated as simple citizens. They, as well as the clergy, would have wished the same number of electors as the Third Estate. The Third Estate naturally feared "the Greeks bearing gifts". They dreaded the prestige of the nobles and believed that in a single assembly the nobles might obtain control and secure a disproportionate number of deputations. This was not the only fear. There was a rumor that for the administration of the city there was to be created a commission in which the three estates should be equally represented. This provoked a motion in one district assembly that the clergy and the nobles should begin individually by entering the primary assemblies as simple citizens. Had a loyal coöperation between the three orders of Paris been possible, it would have had an important influence not only upon the method of voting in the States-General but also upon the municipal movement in July.¹

The details of the elections were regulated by decree April 13². One of its most important provisions was a distribution of Paris into sixty arrondissements or districts, named generally from the churches in which the primary electoral assemblies were to meet. Although these districts grouped men who were strangers to one another and who had never been accustomed to act together, they were not long in acquiring a distinctive political character; and what were devised in the spring as pieces of election machinery became in the fall semi-independent governments, formidable to the central authority not only of Paris but also of France.

¹ Chassin, *Les Élections et les Cahiers de Paris en 1789*, 4 vols. (*Collection de documents relatifs à l'histoire de Paris pendant la Révolution française*); see I, 122, 333-336, 359-362, II, 167, 218 ff. Also *Motion faite par un citoyen dans l'assemblée du district de St.-Germain des Prés* (pièce, Bibl. Nat.). Count Lally-Tollendal, one of the most brilliant of the Constituents and a Paris nobleman, wrote in January, 1790: "Plus on avait semé de désunion et de rivalité, plus un exemple d'union et de concorde devenait nécessaire. Celui qu'eût donné la capitale eût été important. Un vœu commun, et juste autant qu'unanime, formé par huit cent mille citoyens, eût étouffé les semences de haine que des missionnaires de discordes avaient répandue dans une partie de la France." *Mémoire ou second lettre* (pièce, Bibl. Nat.), 14-15.

² Reprinted in Chassin, I, 399-405.

It was the intention of the government to restrict as far as possible the action of these district or primary assemblies. Their officers were to be chosen by the *bureau de la ville*, and they were not to forward to the general assembly of electors any cahiers or statements of principles. The qualifications for voters excluded the bulk of the poorer workingmen. Those who paid a poll-tax of six livres were admitted to the primary assemblies, just as they had previously been admitted to parish assemblies. Capacity was recognized as establishing an alternative claim, proved by the possession of a university degree, of letters of mastership in the arts, or of certain official titles. Against the distinguishing features of these decrees there were many protests. The attempt to bridle the assemblies was more generally criticized than anything else¹. The size of the tax qualification, or the existence of any such qualification, was also here and there condemned.

The primary assemblies of the Third Estate are interesting because they were the first essay in political action by the Paris bourgeoisie. Elaborate military precautions had been taken against disturbances. Probably it was because of this display of authority, and of its natural consequence—rumors of a popular insurrection, that so many of the bourgeois did not appear². Instead of from thirty to forty thousand being present, only 11,706 votes were cast. One man described his haste to enter the church before the crowd became too great, but to his astonishment no more people were there than there would have been had it been announced that the Abbé Cotin³ was to preach. Those who did come felt instinctively that a new day had dawned, that they had ceased to be merely subjects and had become citizens. Bailly, the Academician, who was to be the first mayor of Paris and who was to pay for his faults, if not for his virtues, with his head, wrote, "When I found myself in the district assembly I felt that I was breathing a new atmosphere: it was a phenomenon to be something in the political order."⁴ On the whole the meetings were tranquil. Even Montjoie, later a bitter adversary of the men who became the leaders in Paris, acknowledged this. He noted that except in the outskirts of the faubourgs there were present only

¹ See particularly *Arrêts concernant le choix des Électeurs de Paris* (Bibl. Nat., pièce), adopted, so says the pamphlet, in an assembly of citizens April 19. Chassin believes it was prepared at the house of Adrien Duport, a friend of Lafayette.

² This is the opinion of more than one observer. Quénard, secretary of the district of Petits Augustins, asserts it in his *Tableau historique*, the introduction to *Portraits des Personnages célèbres de la Révolution*, 38–39. Cf. Mes Loisirs, the manuscript journal of Hardy (Bibl. Nat., Mss. fr. nouv. acq. 2667.)

³ Immortalized by Molière in the *Femmes Savantes* under the name Trissotin.

⁴ Bailly, *Mémoires*, II, 307.

the élite of the bourgeoisie, members of the academies, lawyers, rich merchants, artisans, and artists. This was not a source of unmixed satisfaction to him any more than to men of more democratic sympathies, for he saw out in the streets, the markets, and the workshops the laborers who patiently took up day after day their painful tasks, but who could not approach these assemblies. "Who can tell us", he thought, "if the despotism of the bourgeoisie will not succeed the pretended aristocracy of the nobles?"¹

Although the assemblies gave no ground for fearing public outbreaks, their sessions revealed an ominous spirit of independence. Many of them decided to regard the decrees of April 13 as simple advice. They insisted upon organizing their assemblies and choosing their own officers. Sometimes they were content to elect the officials who had been sent to preside over them, in case these men were willing to regard such an election as the sole title to the position. At other times they selected men from their own number and disregarded the protests of the dispossessed officials.² Once in control, the larger number of these assemblies did not adjourn until they had drawn up a cahier, some of them instructing their electors to be governed strictly by its terms³. In a few instances also a determined effort was made to render these assemblies permanent during the continuance of the States-General. Although this effort had no consequences of immediate importance, it is particularly interesting because it revealed tendencies in these districts which in July and afterward rendered them at once useful and formidable.⁴ Like many other questions in the history of Revolutionary Paris, it is rendered obscure by the destruction of the municipal records in May, 1871.

¹ Montjoie, *Histoire de la Révolution de France et de l'Assemblée Nationale*, I, 87.

² Chassin believes that only about ten conformed to the regulations, II, 337.

³ The cahiers that have been preserved present various schemes for the reorganization of Paris as well as for improvements along the practical lines of public works, health, and industry. There is a general desire for a freely-elected body of municipal officers. For the text of these cahiers see Chassin, *op. cit.*

⁴ Although Montjoie speaks of the pretensions of the voters to remain assembled, his words throw no light on the scope of the movement, *op. cit.*, I, 88. Quénard's remark, apropos of July 13, that the districts had been closed since the end of the elections, is decisive, especially since it is supported by the records of the organization of the districts in July. *Portraits*, 43. Further evidence is offered by the fact that Charton, one of the electors, proposed in their assembly, July 10, that the districts be invited to assemble in the places where they had been convoked in April, that they be authorized to name their own officers, and to remain in session until the withdrawal of the troops that surrounded Paris: *Procès-verbal des séances et délibérations de l'assemblée générale des électeurs de Paris, réunis à l'hôtel de ville, le 14 juillet 1789*, rédigé depuis le 26 avril jusqu'au 21 mai 1789, par M. Bailly, . . . et depuis le 22 mai jusqu'au 30 juillet 1789, par M. Duveyrier, 3 vols., I, 158-159.

The tendency toward permanence in one or two districts was purely practical in its character. Saint-Étienne du Mont decided to keep its organization together until it learned whether its refusal to obey the decrees governing the election would be held to invalidate the credentials of its electors. Just before the assembly of Saint-Roch completed its work, one of its members, "seeing with grief" the moment of separation, urged that they meet once a week in order to correspond with the Paris deputies at the States-General. His aim was the revival of public spirit¹. In the only other cases about which definite information exists the aim was more distinctly political. The district Notre-Dame held at least two meetings between the end of the primary assemblies and the uprising in July. At the second the question was raised of establishing a commission of sixty, with one delegate from each district, to formulate the opinions of the districts as new problems came up for discussion in the National Assembly. The question was also asked if the electors, who, as will be explained, had resumed their sessions, could take any decision without consulting the districts.² This is one of the earliest expressions of a determination that the primary assemblies must be consulted on every important matter even by the National Assembly. Those who most stoutly defended the doctrine knew more about the *comitia tributa* of the Romans than about the representative theory, which, indeed, they regarded as a medieval invention inconsistent with the sovereignty of the people.

In another district a species of permanence was decided upon as a result of the energetic efforts of a man to whom Paris was to owe its first provisional organization, Jean Pierre Brissot. Like many others, after the announcement of the States-General he published views on their organization and on the elections.³ His desire to be chosen one of the deputies of Paris was scarcely veiled in these writings. And as far as qualifications were concerned he was fitted to take an intelligent part in the work of the States-General. He had resided in England, had traveled in America, and probably had a more accurate knowledge of American constitutional methods than any other Frenchman save Lafayette. Unhappily by what

¹ *Discours* (Bibl. Nat., pièce), by Millin de Grandmaison.

² *Seconde suite de l'Assemblée du dist. ou département de Notre-Dame* (Bibl. Nat., pièce). Cf. *Projet de Règlement* (Bibl. Nat., pièce), a radical expression of the referendum idea, submitted to the district Capucins de la Chaussée-d'Antin.

³ His *Plan de conduite* appeared in April. He had also published *Trois mots aux Parisiens*, a pamphlet not credited to him by Tourneux in his *Bibliographie de l'histoire de Paris pendant la Révolution*, nor in the *Catalogue de l'histoire de France*. For proof of his authorship, see his *Scrutin de l'Élection de Paris*, 7, and *Patriote français*, no. 170.

Brissot felicitously called a "singular circumstance", but which was nothing more singular than a lack of votes, he was not even chosen one of the electors. He at once determined to have his doctrines appear, if not his person.¹ After a bitter contest he persuaded his district, the Filles Saint-Thomas, to give imperative instructions to its electors. These instructions were substantially his work, if not drawn by him. What was still more important, he pushed through the creation of a committee of correspondence, which should correspond with the Paris deputies and which should remain in existence until a "Declaration of Rights" should be sanctioned.

The electoral assembly was a repetition on a larger scene of what had been done in the districts. As the officers of the Châtelet who had been appointed to preside would not accept an election from the electors as alone giving them this right, they were courteously forced to withdraw, and the assembly chose its own officers. The electors also decided to continue their sessions during the States-General, although the government had assigned to them simply the task of selecting twenty deputies and drawing up a cahier. When the elections were completed, May 23, they adjourned until June 7 to meet at a place indicated by a committee². It did not prove to be easy to carry this decision into effect. The minister, M. de Villedeuil, to whose department Paris belonged, when consulted by Bailly, replied that the mission of the electors was ended³. Nevertheless the committee went to the Hôtel de Ville to ask the use of one of its halls. There it received a similar answer. By June 25 a private hall had been found in which the electors reassembled⁴. The momentous changes which resulted during these very days in the triumph of the Third Estate at Versailles compelled a different answer to the next request for a hall at the Hôtel de

¹ See *Discours* (Bibl. Nat., pièce) prononcé par M. Brissot de Warville, à l'Élection du District de la rue des Filles Saint-Thomas, le 21 Avril 1789, nouvelle édition, etc., and *Observations sur la nécessité d'établir. . . des comités de correspondance*. This brochure is reedited by Chassin to appear as a motion made by Brissot, I, 400-402. It is apparent from his subsequent pamphlets, a *Précis* addressed to the electoral assembly and a *Scrutin de l'Élection de Paris ou lettre de M.B.D.W. à un électeur*, that he still hoped to be chosen a deputy; warning the assembly of its duty to choose the best men whether they were electors or not. The electors did go outside of their number for four deputies, but Brissot was not among the four.

² One of the committee was Thuriot de la Rozière, who was to play a prominent part July 14, and who, during the Convention, was to be a leading Montagnard. Another was Bancal des Issarts, a friend of Brissot and the Rolands.

³ Bailly, *Mémoires*, I, 235-236.

⁴ "Chez un traiteur de la rue Dauphine, dans une salle dite du Musée, qu'une société de gens de lettres voulut bien leur céder." *Procès-verbal*, I, 88. The elector Dusaulx says that two or three hundred met at this place. *Insurrection Parisienne (L'œuvre des sept jours)*, 16.

Ville. The provost of the merchants did not allow the deputation even to conclude its formal speech, but interrupted with the declaration that the Hôtel de Ville was "notre maison commune". An assembly in which the influential men of Paris had confidence was thus installed in the natural home of the commune two weeks before circumstances threw upon it the heaviest responsibilities.¹

III.

The electoral assembly was as able a body of men as it would have been possible to choose from the bourgeoisie of Paris. It was often criticized because nearly half of the number were lawyers too much inclined to speechmaking. This reproach came from literary men who were inundating Paris with pamphlets. If it did remain chiefly a body of bourgeois, this was not altogether its fault, for invitations to the new sessions were sent to the electors of the other two orders. By July 14 only seventeen nobles and twenty-five ecclesiastics had responded.

The first meetings of the electors were coincident with the crisis at Versailles. When a royal army began to gather about the city and disorder increased within it, various projects were brought before them for the reorganization of the municipal administration, for their own transformation into a communal assembly, and especially for the establishment of a citizen guard.² Alarmed by the growing multitude of vagabonds, whom they called *gens sans aveu* or more briefly *brigands*, they looked upon such a guard chiefly as a protection against riot, incidentally depriving the ministry of its excuse for bringing an army into the neighborhood of Paris. It would also render the success of an attack on the city too doubtful to warrant the attempt.³ Necker considered the establishment of a guard as the best means consistent with liberty of preventing a recurrence of scenes like the rescue of the mutinous *gardes-françaises* from the Abbaye prison.⁴

¹ Flesselles gave his reasons in a letter to the Garde des Sceaux: "J'ai pensé, Monseigneur, que l'état des choses n'était plus le même qu'à l'époque où j'en avais fait le refus, parce que le Roi venait d'autoriser MM. les députés à demander à leurs commettans des explications ou interprétations de leurs pouvoirs; que, de plus dans le moment d'une agitation aussi forte que celle qui règne, il était de la prudence et de la sagesse du Bureau de la Ville d'accueillir la demande qui lui était faite." Chassin, III, 445-446.

² The first motion was made June 25 by Nicholas de Bonneville, and inserted in the *Procès-verbal* of July 10, when several other motions in a similar sense impelled him to insist on priority. *Procès-verbal*, I, 130 ff. Cf. projects of Carra, Bancal des Issarts, and Charton, *ibid.*, 139 ff.

³ This appears from the several propositions as well as from the form the matter finally took July 11. *Ibid.*, I, 173-174.

⁴ Bailly says Necker made this remark to him July 1, *Mémoires*, I, 267.

The news of the dismissal of Necker did not reach Paris until long after noon, Sunday, July 12. Rumors of the incidents in the Palais Royal, on the boulevards, and in the Place Louis XV impelled the people to gather at the Hôtel de Ville. Some of the electors also came about six o'clock. They could never forget the scenes that met their eyes at that time and for the next ten days.¹ The problem would have been difficult had the crowd been composed wholly of honest men who sought arms only to defend themselves against an attack which they heard had already begun. But in this crowd came hundreds who realized that for the first time they could indulge in all sorts of violence without being locked up in the prisons and broken on the wheel the next day. Indeed they could count upon being regarded as energetic patriots to whom the authorities could address kindly counsel and not sharp words of warning. These men revealed their presence by threatening to burn the Hôtel de Ville if their demands were not granted.

The crowd did not respect the enclosure within which the electors were gathering. They pressed the electors back upon the officers' bureau. A thousand confused voices demanded arms, the order to sound the tocsin, authority for the citizens to arm in order to repulse the troops. The electors had no legal powers, and they could not give to others what they did not themselves possess, but this was no time for a discussion of delicate questions of legality. They directed the concierge to deliver the arms that were at the Hôtel de Ville. The impatient mob soon broke into the room where the arms of the *gardes de la ville* were stored. This act of doubtful wisdom, considering that the guards were an effective though small force, was more than equaled a moment after when a vagabond clad in a shirt, with bare legs and no shoes, shouldered a gun and took the place of a disarmed guard at the door of the great hall. Finally about eleven o'clock there was a sufficient number of electors present to take more general measures. It was voted that the districts should be convoked at once and that electors should go through the city and disperse the mobs. Already sinister reports had come that the vagabonds were spreading themselves armed and threatening through all quarters.

The thirteenth was for Paris the most critical day of the upheaval. The real danger came not so much from the troops about the city as from the disorderly elements within it. The government was too irresolute to order an attack when the attitude of the Paris-

¹ The description of incidents at the Hôtel de Ville is taken from the *Procès-verbal* except where otherwise noted.

ians was so bold. But the sacking of the convent Saint Lazare, the opening of the doors of the prison La Force, the attempt of the prisoners at the Châtelet to break out, the burning of the barriers, proved that if vigorous action was not taken the city was in grave danger, and that, at the least, the honesty of its political aims would be compromised. The action of the electors was given a certain color of legality because of the coöperation of the *bureau de la ville*, although this bureau had no authority to take the measures it became partly responsible for. Neither electors nor bureau assumed an attitude openly hostile to the king. The circumstances offered an excuse for what they did on the thirteenth, although had an attack been made by the royal army it is evident that they would have managed or organized the defense. This is proved by what occurred on the fourteenth.

On this first day there was no note of discord between the electors who had assumed extraordinary powers and the district assemblies. These bodies were busied with their organization and with provisional measures of defense. Early in the morning the ringing of the bells called the citizens to the churches where they had met to choose their electors in April¹. The electors also began to gather at the Hôtel de Ville. To quiet the clamorous multitude they announced that the establishment of the citizen guard had already been voted, and asked the citizens to return to their districts. Cries for arms were the only response to this request. When they explained that they knew nothing of the city administration and that it was necessary to appeal to the provost of the merchants, the crowd demanded that he be found.² Not long afterward he came, and soon

¹ Hardy wrote in his journal: "Vers dix heures du matin rue St. Jacques. . . se fait entendre un tambour qui annonçait de la part des officiers qu'en eût à se réunir à l'instant par districts dans les différentes églises, comme on l'avait déjà fait au mois d'avril précédent. . . et bientôt après ces Eglises font entendre une seule cloche en forme de tocsin pour appeler les citoyens de tous les ordres aux différentes assemblées." But this honest bourgeois could not attend his assembly because "mon épouse ne veut jamais me laisser aller". *MS. cit.*, VIII, 385.

² Dusaulx says the people believed that there was a secret arsenal at the Hôtel de Ville, a notion nearly fatal to the electors. *Op. cit.*, 28. In the afternoon a large supply of powder was seized just as it was being despatched to Rouen. It was saved with difficulty from the mob on the Place de la Grève. Before this new stock arrived, in order to protect from plunder what was already at the Hôtel de Ville a brave ecclesiastic, the Abbé Lefevre [Lefebvre], undertook to supervise its distribution, and remained at his perilous post for thirty-six hours, constantly menaced by pistols, pikes, and knives. One of the mob sat tranquilly on a barrel of powder smoking a pipe. Happily he had a thrifty soul and was willing to sell the pipe to the abbé for three francs. *Rapport des Journées du 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 juillet*, Abbé Lefevre, Arch. Nat., C 134, dossier 6. Cf. *Procès-verbal*, I, 231-235. During the night of July 13-14 the electors at the Hôtel de Ville disarmed more than 150 vagabonds, drunk with wine and brandy and asleep in the halls. *Ibid.*, 270.

the law-officer and the four aldermen were there also. The right to preside was conceded to the provost. One of the electors assumed that the crowd was Paris and stated the question to it. The new sovereign at once confirmed the decision. The members of the *bureau de la ville* were asked to join the electors in taking the necessary measures. They voted to form a permanent committee¹, chosen by the assembly and divided into subcommittees, to take charge of provisioning the city, of organizing the guard, and the like. The lieutenant-general of the police was sent for to furnish necessary information. Each of the districts was asked to draw up a list of 200 persons, subsequently to be increased, to constitute the guard and to provide for public security according to instructions to be furnished by the permanent committee. The districts were also to receive the arms of persons who were attached to no district. Finally they were asked to confirm these decrees. From this time forward until the first crisis was past the permanent committee was the center of activity. The electors adjourned until afternoon, while the committee elaborated its plan of a *milice parisienne*.²

The committee was to receive little assistance from the lieutenant-general of police. He promised what information his subordinates could offer about the method of provisioning the city, but he felt the personal danger which threatened him and which resulted that night in the sack of his *hôtel*. It was of little service that the electors made him jointly responsible with the *bureau de la ville* for this important task. The attempt is interesting, for it shows how disinclined they were to disorganize the existing administration. They kept as close to the borders of legality as possible. The conduct of Flesselles was within the next few hours to bring suspicion upon the *bureau de la ville* and to make a preservation of the old machinery impossible. Flesselles was a royal officer. As such he was naturally anxious not to compromise himself. The most reasonable theory of his conduct was that he was endeavoring to gain time, and that while he accepted a position as presiding officer of the electors and of the permanent committee, he was reluctant to coöperate effectively

¹ The title "permanent", afterward so misunderstood, meant a committee which was to meet day and night. Cf. Dusaulx, 27. When its members were chosen, the crowd complained that only electors were named. One of the electors cried out, "Whom do you wish that we name?" "Me", replied a modest patriot, and he was chosen by acclamation.

² Late in the day the command of the new guard was offered to the Duc d'Aumont, with the Marquis de la Salle as second in command. La Salle became commander the following day because of the irresolution of d'Aumont. The colors of the guard were to be blue and red. The district Notre-Dame tied the two with a white ribbon, anticipating the tricolor. MS. Arch. Nat., C 134.

in arming the bourgeoisie. He was accused of sending deputations of districts which asked for arms to places where no stock of arms had ever been kept, and of causing boxes of clothing marked "*artillerie*" to be sent to the Hôtel de Ville. But he could hardly have been foolhardy enough to have attempted so transparent an artifice as the last, and in the other cases he may have been himself deceived as well as other members of the permanent committee.¹

Meanwhile the districts had been busy organizing, drawing up lists for the guard, establishing patrols, and disarming the vagabonds who during the earlier part of the day almost had possession of the streets. The success with which they carried out this plan became apparent before night. The result is best described by an English traveler²:

Early in the afternoon (July 13) we began to perceive among the motley groups of mob who paraded the streets with such symptoms of irritation as must soon have produced excess, here and there a man of decent exterior, carrying a musket, and assuming a respectable military appearance. The number of these gradually increased, and it was evidently their intention at once to conciliate and disarm the irregular band; and this appeared to be principally effected before the evening, at which time the regularly armed citizens almost exclusively occupied the streets.

This traveler, Dr. Rigby, marveled at the extraordinary address which the citizens showed in accomplishing their delicate task. They were helped by the *gardes-françaises*, most of whom had cast in their lot from the first with the party of resistance to the royal troops and who felt that they would be ruined if the affair degenerated into a riotous orgy.³

During the momentous hours of the fourteenth the burden fell almost exclusively upon the permanent committee, for because of the multitude that had invaded the Hôtel de Ville it was impossible for the electors to organize their assembly until the day was over. The action of the committee showed the same conservative desire

¹ Cf. Dusaulx, 34. Also *Récit des Tentatives du Dist. des Mathurins, pour se procurer des armes et munitions dans la journée du Lundi, 13 juillet 1789* (Bibl. Nat., pièce).

² Dr. Rigby's *Letters from France*, 55, 57. Jefferson was also surprised at the good order so promptly reestablished. Montjoie noted the change in the streets, *op. cit.*, part III, 86. Cf. the summary of what was accomplished given by the secretary of the electors. *Procès-verbal*, I, 263.

³ Jules Flammermont, *La Journée du 14 juillet 1789*, clxxx, note 2, quotes this view of the conduct of the *gardes-françaises* from the despatches of the Saxon minister, Salmour. Not all the *gardes-françaises* had as yet abandoned their officers. One post on the Chaussée-d'Antin declined on the night of the thirteenth to send a guard to the Hôtel de Ville. *Procès-verbal*, I, 255.

to remain within the bounds of legality, and, when this was impossible, to take measures which were likely to restore order or preserve the city from actual attack. Early in the morning, impelled by constant rumors that the royal troops were advancing into the faubourgs, it caused barricades to be constructed, ditches dug, and all other measures to be taken which could effectively oppose the entrance of the royal troops. A little before this Éthis de Corny, the law-officer of the Hôtel de Ville, was sent to the Invalides to ask for arms, but he arrived only to be a helpless spectator while a multitude composed of delegations of districts, bodies of the new citizen guard, and *gens sans aveu* burst through the gates or escalated the low ramparts and ransacked the vast building, carrying off 32,000 guns.

The committee was even less successful at the Bastille. At eight o'clock, when it was reported that the guns of this fortress were trained on the Rue Saint-Antoine, a deputation was sent to assure De Launey that the people would make no attack on him and to urge him to withdraw his guns. The request was complied with, and this intervention might have been successful had the deputation at once returned to the Hôtel de Ville. Unhappily the members accepted De Launey's invitation to breakfast. The long delay led the crowd about the fortress to suspect that they were being held as prisoners. But the more disastrous consequence was that the committee was left in ignorance of the situation and was unable therefore to take any measures to restrain the crowd, which grew momentarily more excited and which threatened the garrison. Indeed this first deputation did not reach the Hôtel de Ville until just before the fighting began. In order to put an end to the actual conflict the committee sent another deputation to ask De Launey to receive into the Bastille a detachment of the *milice parisienne*, which should guard the fortress in company with the garrison, but which should remain under the command of the committee. Matters became critical before the return of this delegation, which did not succeed in communicating with De Launey. It was determined to send another, this time with drum and flag of truce. The crowd was so convinced that the fighting was due to the treachery of De Launey that the committee or at least the military bureau felt forced to abandon its attitude of mediation and to coöperate in the attack in case the last deputations failed.¹ About the same time Hulin, unknown to the committee, led to the Bastille a body of *gardes-françaises* who had placed themselves at the service of the committee earlier in the

¹ *Ibid.*, 335.

day. They took with them several cannon and trained cannon-eers. It was these cannon and the guards which effected the capture of the Bastille. After they had gone the two deputations returned, the last reporting that even its flag had been fired upon with every appearance of treachery.

The fighting at the Bastille had sinister echoes at the Hôtel de Ville. It is impossible in a few words to suggest the horror of confusion against which the committee and the few electors who were able to gather were forced to struggle. Mingled among reputable citizens, demanding arms or making complaints, were curiosity seekers and vagabonds. These men constantly menaced the lives of the committee and threatened to burn the Hôtel de Ville. On the seats surrounding the great hall, where the electors were to meet, was a crowd armed with guns, pikes, sabers, and even with sticks to which knives were fastened. Another part of the room was filled by men whose sinister features reminded the electors of the vagabonds who had been disarmed the day before. They were now armed for the most part with ancient battle-axes and halberds which came from the plunder of the *garde meuble*. All these men kept calling for the electors, a small number of whom were present, but who were powerless to compel silence or even to find a place to sit down.¹

While the result of the struggle at the Bastille was still in doubt, a deputation from the Palais Royal appeared denouncing Flesselles as a traitor.² At first Flesselles was scarcely able to face his accusers with calmness. To give himself countenance he attempted to eat a crust of bread, but he could scarcely swallow. One of the oldest members of the committee, Dusaulx, energetically defended him, urging that it was dangerous to dispute while men were being killed at the Bastille. Reasoning of this sort satisfied everybody except the men from the Palais Royal. It was then that the second deputation to the Bastille was despatched, partly as a countermove to the denunciators. But these men insisted that Flesselles at least go into the great hall. He felt himself lost, but went out saying, "Come, gentlemen, come to the great hall, and let the committee work a little". Probably he would have been murdered on the spot had the mob not been afraid of killing one of the electors.

Shortly after this the news of the fall of the Bastille came, and with it rushed in another crowd with some of the prisoners. The

¹ Abridged from Pitra's account, in the Flammermont edition, *op. cit.*, 10.

² This was the first exploit of the Palais Royal since authority had changed hands, and it indicated that, whatever the régime, that group of agitators was likely to remain restless and arrogant.

joy of the conquest did not displace the desire for the blood of the conquered, and in spite of the heroic efforts of Élie, one of the leaders in the fight against the Bastille, two of the prisoners were snatched away by the mob, and were hanged in front of the Hôtel de Ville. Another victim was wanted. New accusations were raised against Flesselles. His colleagues now maintained an ominous silence. It was proposed that he be held as a hostage or imprisoned in the Châtelet, but the general opinion demanded that he go to the Palais Royal to be judged. Flesselles abandoned himself to his fate, bewildered no doubt by the new theory of liberty that erected into a supreme tribunal any crowd bold enough to arrogate to itself such functions. He said simply, "Well, then, gentlemen, come to the Palais Royal". He descended the stairs and crossed the square unmolested, but at the corner of the Quai Pelletier he was shot by an unknown young man.¹ His head and his body immediately shared the fate of those of De Launey and the other victims of the mob's fury.

IV.

The capture of the Bastille marked the decisive defeat of the party which had persuaded the king to surround Versailles and Paris with an army and appoint a reactionary ministry. Paris had little to fear save from itself. The irremediable ruin of the old administration had been signalized by the murder of the provost of the merchants and the resignation of the lieutenant-general of the police. The task of restoring order and of securing a supply of food had fallen to the electors and to their committee. The new civic guard could protect life and property, but since its orders came from sixty different districts it could contribute little to the reëstablishment of normal conditions. Indeed by constantly arresting carriages and individuals it increased the confusion. The barriers were also closed, so that little food could be brought into the markets and the octroi could not be collected. The permanent committee attempted to master the situation by dividing its own work among four bureaus and by organizing constant coöperation between itself or the electors and the districts. To bring about harmonious action was exceedingly difficult. Projects were voted but not carried into effect. One of these projects asked the districts to send a deputy each morning and evening to the Hôtel de Ville to deliberate with the electors. Had it been adopted by the districts, it might have forestalled the

¹ Flammermont, in order to relieve the fourteenth of July of the odium of this murder, suggests that it was due to private vengeance.

action of the more restless of them to replace the electors by a new assembly of delegates.¹

The district assemblies with singularly few exceptions concerned themselves with the practical problems of order. Occasionally they sent deputies or commissioners to the Hôtel de Ville to act with the electors or to report their action. One district which later opposed the establishment of any strictly representative central assembly went so far on this first day of revolution as to authorize the electors to declare themselves the representatives of the commune, with power to do anything necessary to maintain the public security.² Brissot persuaded his district to request the others to unite in creating a committee of safety, composed of six members from each. This act, however, had no immediate consequences.³

In several instances the more natural grouping by parishes was hastily adopted. This movement was strong in the parish of Saint-Séverin. The members abandoned their districts and excluded other men who had in April met at Saint-Séverin as the district headquarters. They even threatened with violence their neighbors of the parish of Saint-Germain-le-Vieil, if they did not immediately withdraw. This forced the three neighboring parishes to adopt the same system. A little later Saint-Séverin discovered that the district system was too firmly established in other parts of the city to be shaken.⁴

The most important event of the fifteenth was the choice of Lafayette as commander of the new guard and of Bailly as mayor. A deputation was sent by the National Assembly to convey the news that the king had given way completely and that the troops were to be withdrawn from Paris and Versailles. Lafayette was at the head of this delegation and Bailly was one of its prominent members. After it had been formally received and, on the proposition of the archbishop of Paris, was about to go to Notre Dame to render thanks to God by a *Te Deum* for the restoration of peace, suddenly cries were heard proclaiming Lafayette *commandant-général de la milice parisienne*, ignoring the fact that the Marquis de la Salle had already been appointed to this position. Earlier in the day among

¹ *Procès-verbal*, I, 425-427. An interesting account of the difficulty of getting out of Paris even on the fifteenth is given in Dr. Rigby's *Letters from France*, 72-83.

² This was the Prémontrés. MS. Arch. Nat. C 134, dossier 1.

³ *Arrêts*, Filles Saint-Thomas, du 13 juillet 1789 (Bibl. Nat., pièce).

⁴ *District et Paroisse de St.-Séverin* (Bibl. Nat., pièce). For Saint-Germain-le-Vieil, see *Mémoire*, MS. Arch. Nat. C 134, dossier 6. Cf. Bibl. Nat. Mss. fr. nouv. acq. 2696, fol. 49, and Hardy, VIII, 392, 398. Hardy says the parish system was in general favor as late as July 16. Certain districts also met first as parishes. Loustallot argued a month later in *Révolutions de Paris*, no. VIII, p. 7, that the parish system was more effective.

several electors gathered about the bureau discussing the question of the command, Moreau de Saint-Méry had silently pointed to the bust of Lafayette on the mantel, and all had agreed that the defense of French liberty should be intrusted to the "Illustrious Defender of the Liberty of the New World"¹. Bailly was in the same manner proclaimed provost of the merchants, but the title was immediately changed to mayor of Paris. He stammered out a few expressions of gratitude and protested his incapacity to bear so heavy a burden. He accepted the office under the impression that he was to fill merely the place of nominal honor left vacant by the death of Flesselles, but he soon learned that the departure of Necker and the resignation of De Crosne had abandoned to the new officials both subsistence and the police. It was characteristic of Bailly that although the appointment to the office of provost of the merchants belonged to the king and although he still recognized the king's right, he adopted a waiting attitude because he was told that Paris would be displeased if he requested royal confirmation².

Both Bailly and Lafayette entered upon their duties at once. It had become evident that for the moment the most important task was to provide the city with food. If nothing was done, within two days there would be no bread. Bailly immediately passed into the committee of subsistence, which, created by the permanent committee on the fifteenth, was enlarged by the electors the following day. M. de Montaran, *intendant du commerce*, and M. Doumer, who had been purchasing wheat and flour, were also to assist in this work. M. de Crosne, who had not dared to retain his position as lieutenant-general of the police, also came until his life was in danger and he was obliged to emigrate. The task was enormous, because under the paternal theory of administration the grain trade had only for short periods of time been left to take care of itself, and consequently when, terrified by the excesses of the thirteenth and fourteenth, all the minor agents of the administration fled, a new system had to be improvised hastily to save the city from famine. It was impossible to entrust the task to experienced hands like those of M. Doumer. He had been Necker's agent, but he was associated with the old order, and distrust was so great that to give him authority in this matter would probably have led only to his own

¹ *Procès-verbal*, I, 422. The bust was the gift of the state of Virginia. Already on the thirteenth Brissot had proposed Lafayette as colonel-general of the guard. MS. Arch. Nat. W.

² Bailly, *Mémoires*, II, 39-40. Since the permanent committee had appointed La Salle commander, a delicate question would have arisen had not La Salle gracefully withdrawn, offering to serve under Lafayette. When he wrote his memoirs, Lafayette seems to have been under the impression that La Salle had resigned. II, 259.

destruction as a "detestable monopolist". The legend of the *pacte de famine* was firmly established in the popular mind. Important as this work was, Bailly's constant attendance at the committee gave the electors an opportunity to ignore their new chief, and to set an example which, followed by the subsequent assemblies, brought war into the new provisional government.¹

With a curious inconsequence the electors on the sixteenth voted the immediate demolition of the Bastille, a fortress belonging to the king, which they treated as lawful prize of war, and on the same day sent a deputation to present to him the "respect, love, and fidelity of all the inhabitants of his good town of Paris", and particularly to thank him for ordering the withdrawal of the troops and throwing himself unreservedly upon the support of the National Assembly. This was a startling indication of the extent of the revolution of the fourteenth. The royal authority was destroyed. It rested with the provisional government of Paris to say what should be done with the property of the crown within its reach.

The victory of Paris was confirmed by the coming of the king the following day. This fact furnished point to a not altogether happy bon mot of the new mayor, who handed the king the keys at one of the barriers. "These", he said, "are the same keys that were presented to Henry IV; he had reconquered his people: here it is the people which has reconquered its king." The preparation for the ceremony gave the old *bureau de la ville* an opportunity to display its ancient privileges for the last time.² The members were permitted without protest from the electors to distinguish themselves from this body by wearing the formal municipal costume. They even went so far as to raise the question whether they should present themselves on their knees. To the profuse expressions of affection and respect which the assembly gave him the king replied, "The best manner of proving your attachment to me is to reëstablish tranquility and to put the malefactors who shall be arrested into the hands of ordinary justice."³ He also expressed his pleasure that Bailly was mayor and Lafayette commander. Just as he was entering his carriage he said more formally to Lafayette that he confirmed his nomination. Lafayette, however, sought a confirmation more suited to the new order of affairs.

¹ Bailly, *Mémoires*, 70-73.

² The feeling against the *bureau de la ville* was increasing in the districts. Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois protested against receiving its propositions unless countersigned by the electors. MS. Arch. Nat. C 134. Cf. *Procès-verbal*, II, 68.

³ *Ibid.*, 102.

V.

Already on the sixteenth the interesting question of the authority of the electors to administer the affairs of the city was discussed. Two days before, the district of the Cordeliers, which later under the leadership of Danton was to wage war on the central assembly, had protested against the use of the title "permanent" by a committee strictly provisional and of which the districts must preserve the right to choose members¹. The question first presented itself upon the legality of the permanent committee, which, as was argued, had been named by citizens of all classes who happened to be in the Hôtel de Ville on the morning of the thirteenth. It was at once acknowledged that even the electors who were in the committee exercised a doubtful authority, because they had been chosen to elect deputies to the States-General, and not to administer municipal affairs. The result of the discussion was the appointment of a commission to present a plan for a "provisional committee", "which should unite to the legality of its powers a wise distribution of all municipal functions". According to ordinary principles of law this could not be done without the coöperation of the king in his council or at least of the National Assembly. The old régime and its legal basis was, however, destroyed, and for it was substituted the theory of local popular sovereignty in an extreme form.

In his attempt to organize the new military power Lafayette pointed the way to the electors, who were soon forced by popular agitation to follow. If the new organization were to be legal, he said, it must be agreed upon with him by the deputies of all the districts, who should bring to the Hôtel de Ville the general wish of the commune. At the same time he asked that the new force be called the "garde nationale de Paris". His suggestions were at once voted. Within three days this committee was organized, and, after ten days of hard work, it had the most important titles of the new regulation ready to submit to the districts for adoption, subject to such changes as experience might suggest.² The promptitude and energy with which it accomplished this work, so vitally important to the preservation of peace in Paris and even to the performance of the ordinary duties of police, is in strange contrast with the inability of the mayor and the assembly to bring anything definite to pass and to extricate themselves from the circle of their own disputes. It is true their task was more general and they were constantly interrupted by a multitude of administrative questions.

¹ *Extrait du procès-verbal . . . des Cordeliers, 14 juillet* (Bibl. Nat., pièce).

² *Procès-verbal de la formation et des opérations du comité militaire de la ville de Paris* (Bibl. Nat., pièce).

On the eighteenth Bailly and Lafayette asked the electors that their designation as mayor and commandant be confirmed by popular vote. Lafayette also suggested that the wishes of the citizens be obtained concerning the composition of the new municipal body. Without waiting for the report of their commission, the electors adopted a plan, only to change it at the evening session on the same day. Although they did not settle the entire question, it was decided to transform the permanent committee into a provisional committee and to ask each district to choose one member two days later.¹ This decree was sent to the districts the next morning. Already there were various independent schemes in circulation which would cause it to be regarded with circumspection. As one copy was made to do duty for several districts, the reception was even more lukewarm than might otherwise have been expected. In two or three districts there were indorsed on the copy questions as to its legality and complaints about the manner or the promptitude of delivery. One district declined to receive it at all because it was not signed by at least three electors. Most of the officials simply noted its delivery and declared its contents would be laid before the assemblies². Before stating the result of this attempt to solve the problem, it is necessary to explain the independent plans which were its rivals.

Éthis de Corny had endeavored to identify himself thoroughly with the new régime. He had taken a prominent part in the events of the fourteenth. He now turned to the districts and, making use of the formulæ of his old position as law-officer, "required" them in view of the stagnation of affairs and the lack of uniformity in their management to name one or several members, who were to form a committee empowered to maintain order and provide for necessary business. He argued that the permanent committee was in reality provisional, and that the mission of the electors was indeed terminated, as several of them had publicly declared. This requisition was printed and sent to each district³. Even if it did not fulfil its author's purpose, it served to show the districts that the solution of the problem was in their hands and that the electors could not settle it summarily.

Another plan destined to have complete success in its main features originated in the committee of the Filles Saint-Thomas, of

¹ *Procès-verbal*, II, 122-123, 128-129, 135-136.

² The several copies of the decree, with the list of the districts at which each was to be exhibited, and with the indorsements or comments of the district officials who saw them, are preserved in Arch. Nat. C 134, dossier 6, folios 27-32.

³ Bibl. Nat., Mss. fr. nouv. acq. 2683.

which Brissot was president. This plan differed from the one he had suggested on the thirteenth, for much had happened since that time. The committee proposed that as the permanent committee had not received the approbation of the citizens, each district should choose two deputies, forming a committee of 120, to be associated, if the districts wished, with the permanent committee in the task of maintaining public order, and, in concert with Bailly and Lafayette, to agree upon a municipal constitution for Paris, which should be reported to the districts for their approval¹. This document was at once sent to all the districts. It was adopted on the same day, with a few changes which rendered it more hostile to the permanent committee, by the general assembly of Saint-Germain des Prés, and its influence can be traced in the action of other districts². Its final results were apparent only several days later.

Even had the new provisional committee been organized, it is doubtful if the electors would have been allowed to remain as an assembly at the Hôtel de Ville. It had occurred to sixteen districts to send their delegates new powers, but so simple a method of constituting a temporary administration was distasteful to the majority, especially to the eager politicians who hoped to succeed the electors³. Moreover, the provisional committee was never formed. Several districts chose their members, but others, perhaps confused by the letter of Éthis de Corny or preferring the plan suggested by Brissot, sent to the Hôtel de Ville from two to eight delegates. This affair did not have time to work itself out before Bailly, imitating Lafayette's example for the military organization, and doubtless with the Brissot plan before his eyes, proposed a plan of his own, which soon led to a solution.⁴

¹ *Arrêts du Comité général du dist. des Filles Saint-Thomas. Du 18 Juillet* (Bibl. Nat., pièce). Cf. a *Délibération de l'assemblée générale* of same district, July 21 (Bibl. Nat., pièce).

² *Extrait des délibérations (18 juillet, 1789)* (Bibl. Nat., pièce). A comparison of the two decrees shows that the decree of Saint-Germain des Prés was the Filles Saint-Thomas decree with erasures and additions.

³ Bailly says, "beaucoup de personnes les voyaient avec peine, c'est-à dire avec envie, administrer les affaires. Chaque district administrait dans son arrondissement; ceux qui y primaient avaient l'ambition de s'élever à l'administration générale". *Mémoires*, II, 125. Bailly's later chagrins may have predisposed him to look unfavorably upon these eager ambitions. Quénard and Godard write in the same tone. Even Loustallot later appeared to regret the electors when the new statesmen gained control; see *Révolutions de Paris*, no. VII.

⁴ M. Lacroix in his notes, *Actes de la Commune de Paris*, I, 17-19, also shows that the *comité provisoire* never came into existence. He remarks that the list furnished by Robiquet, *Personnel Municipal de Paris*, 33, is the list of the military committee organized July 19. But his own account of the matter is incomplete, because he has not noticed several of the documents in the case. He asks which of the two decrees, morning or evening, was executed. The copies of the decision sent on the nineteenth to the districts answer the question. They give both decrees, the afternoon decree as

Bailly did not intend to take the administration immediately out of the hands of the electors. The function of the proposed committee of 120 was first to work with Lafayette and with himself in drawing up a plan of municipal administration which was to be put into effect provisionally and later modified as the views of the districts might indicate. Bailly believed that the executive power should be left to a small body of officials, and he had no desire to replace one large assembly by another almost as large.¹ The electors understood the mayor to mean that they were to remain at the Hôtel de Ville until a new plan of government had been adopted. The districts had no such notion. In most instances they gave their new delegates powers broader than had been suggested. A few seem to have thought that the two assemblies could coexist; others were determined to have done with the electors at once, looking upon them as ambitious men anxious to preserve their positions. Some went so far as to compel their own electors to withdraw and to forbid the new delegates to take part in any committees at which electors should continue to appear. In the National Assembly Mirabeau treated these unhappy men as simple individuals without mission.²

correcting that of the morning (Arch. Nat. C 134, dossier 6, folios 27-32). The afternoon decree did not, as M. Lacroix supposes, remain merely a project. He remarks that only one district, Saint-Étienne du Mont, named a deputy to this committee, although the Récollets did so unmistakably (Arch. Nat. C 134, dossier 7) as well as Sainte-Élisabeth (*ibid.*, folios 15, 32, and *Procès-verbal*, II, 181) and Saint-Louis en l'Isle (Bibl. Nat. Mss. fr. nouv. acq. 2680). Moreover the Mathurins and Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois decided to choose two, one not being enough (*ibid.*, 2696, fol. 51). It cannot be argued that if the districts chose more than one deputy they did not have in mind the *comité provisoire*, because in April they had sent more deputies to the electoral assembly than the rules allowed. Judging from the evidence in the Mathurins and in the Saint-Germain-l'Auxerrois cases, any district that ventured to send two or more deputies to be in the bureaux into which the *comité provisoire*, like the permanent committee, would naturally be divided, intended to send the *comité provisoire*. Accordingly it is necessary to add the Bonne-Nouvelle (*Extrait de la Délibération*, 20 juillet, Bibl. Nat.), Petits-Pères (Arch. Nat. C 134, dossier 6, fol. 12), Saint-Roch (Bibl. Nat. Mss. fr. nouv. acq. 2665, fol. 21). One or two others might be added without a great stretch of the imagination. The Oratoire was confused by the several schemes in circulation and sent a deputation to the mayor to ascertain the wishes of the majority of the districts "sur la députation à former pour la composition du comité permanent" (Arch. Nat. C 134, dossier 9, fol. 22). It may be added that the permanent committee in order to attenuate the suggestions of their title on the nineteenth crossed out on their printed forms the word "Permanent" and substituted "Provisoire." In a day or two the committee used new stationery from which the offending word had disappeared altogether.

¹ In his letter he speaks of Lafayette and himself as "les seuls représentants constitués légalement par élection libre et par la confirmation que nous avons sollicités". *Actes*, I, 407. It appears that when Bailly wrote his memoirs he had forgotten that in this letter he had associated Lafayette with himself as those with whom the 120 were to work. *Mémoires*, II, 125, 143.

² *Procès-verbal de l'Assemblée Nationale*, for July 23, p. 14; for July 24, pp. 11, 12. Dix-Neuvième Lettre du Comte de Mirabeau à ses Commettans (*Courrier de Pro-*

The new committee or assembly which Bailly had called into existence was organized on the twenty-fifth.¹ In its message of thanks to the electors for the services they had rendered, it intimated that they were to remain in power only until the work could be provided for. Since these hints failed to convince them that their assembly was soon to be dissolved, after four days the new deputies, supported by the more demonstrative of the district politicians, voted that they should present themselves in a body in the hall of the electors, thank them for their wise and courageous conduct, and inform them that the new assembly had received power to administer the affairs of the city, and that it was ready to assume the functions it had asked the electors to exercise temporarily.²

The electors were destined to disappear in a violent political storm, victims of their own generous sentiments. A few days before they had been the helpless witnesses of two more murders.³ Foullon, a member of the short-lived July ministry, and his son-in-law, Bertier, the intendant of Paris, accused of the newly-invented crime of *lèse-nation*, had been literally torn in pieces. Now apparently it was to be the turn of another royal officer, the Baron de Besenval, who had commanded the troops on the twelfth and the thirteenth. With the king's express permission he had attempted to gain Switzerland, his native land, but had been arrested and was being brought to Paris. Necker on his return journey to Versailles had learned of Besenval's arrest and, although he could not procure his release, he had stopped for the moment his transfer to Paris. Necker also

venge), pp. 51-52. Bailly thought Mirabeau was coquetting with the districts in order to replace him as mayor. *Mémoires*, II, 154-155. For reply of electors, see *Procès-verbal*, II, 479-491.

¹ The records of the assembly, carefully edited by S. Lacroix, *Actes de la Commune de Paris*, I. M. Lacroix has added invaluable notes, giving many extracts from documents impossible to obtain outside of Paris. His work serves as a sure guide to students of Revolutionary Paris.

² *Procès-verbal*, II, 531-533, *Actes*, I, 38, 40. It should be noted that many of the electors had been chosen to the new assembly and that others remained in committees for months in spite of the protest of several districts whose suspicions of every phase of incipient aristocracy were stronger than their appreciation of the value of experience in the work of administration.

³ The electors and Mayor Bailly were not without some responsibility for these murders. Bailly frankly confesses in his memoirs his own desire to avoid compromising himself. One's impression in reading his account of the matter is that he was a coward and knew it. See especially *Mémoires*, II, 89. He adds that "There was a real danger in speaking the language of justice and humanity and it was useless to brave this danger". *Ibid.*, II, 123. Lafayette, who was a brave man, but whose action was hampered by a remarkably acute consciousness of popularity, wrote years later that there was at the time "no other means of repression than personal ascendancy" and that there were in the city about 6,000 deserters and 30,000 vagabonds. *Mémoires*, II, 275. Cf. Godard, *Exposé*, 3.

seized the opportunity of his own triumphal reception in Paris to protest before the new assembly and before the electors against proscriptions and to plead Besenval's right to proceed to Switzerland. The deputies, moved by the appeal, instantly voted that Besenval be allowed to avail himself of the king's permission. Two deputies volunteered to carry the order. Necker repeated his appeal to the electors, who were still more deeply stirred by it. They declared in the name of the inhabitants of the capital that Paris pardoned all her enemies, and they further declared that only those were enemies of the nation who by excesses disturbed the public order¹. This extraordinary proceeding drew upon the electors a cloud of condemnation. The city was in an uproar. The district of the Oratoire, urged on by a crowd of spectators, passed a decree nullifying the acts of both the assembly and the electors and despatched a courier to prevent Besenval's release. Another district sent a deputation to the National Assembly to protest against the scheme of amnesty, which it attributed to the electors. Both the electors and the assembly, frightened at the uprising of the revolutionary element, either repealed or attenuated their decrees. It was in the midst of the echoes of this uproar that the electors finally disappeared from the scene as an organized body.²

VI.

It must not be inferred that the electors had since the sixteenth or seventeenth of July been concerned chiefly with the question whether they should remain at the Hôtel de Ville or be replaced by a new assembly of deputies. Undoubtedly they could have more readily solved this problem had not the burden of administering the city and of reëstablishing normal conditions rested upon them or upon their committees of police and subsistence. One of the dangers to the peace of the city was the presence of so large a number of unemployed workmen and of vagabonds who had armed themselves during the first days of the Revolution and who were the ever-ready recruits of each recurring mob. The troubles had paralyzed business and had interrupted industry. It had become difficult for

¹ Bailly had with characteristic timidity advised Necker not to raise so delicate a question. For the record of the new assembly's action, see *Actes*, I, 46-52.

² Gorsas, *Courrier de Versailles à Paris*, no. XXV; *Révolutions de Paris*, no. III, 352 ff. Mirabeau again criticized the electors in the National Assembly, *Courrier de Provence*, no. XXI. The new assembly sent a deputation to the National Assembly, asking for a special tribunal to try such cases as Besenval's, particularly in order that the people might not permit themselves "aucun acte capable de détruire des preuves importantes, en troublant l'ordre indispensable pour les obtenir," that is, put less euphemistically, should not murder men on mere suspicion. *Actes*, I, 62.

employers to receive back their workmen, who for lack of bread drifted toward vagabondism. To leave a large body of such men armed was dangerous. And it was not safe to allow them to pass the barriers and spread themselves through the country, as they were likely to do if the work of disarmament was unwisely begun. It was first settled that all such persons should be disarmed at the barriers. To settle the larger question a method was adopted for all the districts which had been proposed in the district of Saint-Germain des Prés. A notice was posted that the district would buy the guns of all workmen who would bring a certificate that they had returned to work. From July 20 to August 3 a single district purchased 250 muskets and twelve pistols.¹

Another danger grew out of the fact that the courts had ceased to act. The prisons were rapidly being filled with persons arrested on suspicion. The engineers of disorder had little fear that they would be swiftly called to account. To correct the evil the electors on the twentieth formally sent several prisoners to the Châtelet with the request that justice take its ordinary course.² In order to reassure the public mind, constantly alarmed by rumors of plots and insurrections, they also ordered that the theaters be reopened in spite of the threat of several districts to prevent this by force until after Necker's return.³

Although their retention of power was so brief, they were obliged to regulate provisionally the liberty of the press. The permanent committee had authorized the admission to the city of all pamphlets and newspapers. Some of these had proved to be virulent libels. Accordingly the electors laid down the principle "that every citizen is free to print and publish any work whatsoever, if he signs it and is ready to answer for it". When libels began to circulate touching the king himself, they specifically recalled the permission so freely

¹ *Procès-verbal*, II, 125, 157-158. Cf. purchases by Saint-Roch, Bibl. Nat. Mss. fr. nouv. acq. 2670, fol. 55.

² *Procès-verbal*, II, 235, 281-282. Cf. Brissot's *Patriote français* for July 30, p. 3. Many of the arrests had been ordered by the committee of police, one of the four bureaux of the permanent committee, which continued in power nearly four months. One of its members afterward described its action as "the justice of savage peoples, exercised by enlightened men, who were not allowed a moment for reflection and to whom would not have been pardoned the slightest uncertainty or the least delay". This member was Fauchet, who perished with the Girondins in 1793. His reminiscences were given to Godard, *Exposé*, 12-15. The operations of the committee were not so favorably regarded by all, for example, the royalist writer Rivarol in *Journal Politique-National des États-Généraux*, I, 150-151. He spoke of the Parisians demolishing the Bastille with one hand and with the other filling the prisons with poor bourgeois about whom the royal government had never concerned itself.

³ *Procès-verbal*, II, 193-194, 229-230.

given by the committee and ordered the arrest of all distributors of printed matter upon which the name of the printer did not appear, and that the printers should be held responsible in cases where the author was not known, a decree that excited lively protests.¹

The most serious problem was the food supply. This was intrusted to the committee on subsistence, but the electors themselves were obliged to lend their aid. One of the greatest difficulties was the pillaging of convoys of wheat on the Rouen road and the stopping by district officers of grain wagons sent out to Corbeil and other mill towns. Moreover the agents whom the government had formerly employed in supervising the grain supply were now discredited and in actual danger of being murdered. All dealers in grain were likewise in terror. The farmers kept their wheat in their barns because they feared that if they attempted to market it they would be plundered on the road. Before Necker had been dismissed, the government had been buying abroad and selling at a daily loss of 1,800 livres, in spite of the fact that bread was at fourteen and a half sous for four pounds. In the midst of the trouble the increasing distress in Paris led the multitude to cry out for cheaper bread. The committee on subsistence, alarmed at the situation, recommended that the price be reduced to twelve sous, and Bailly, although he disapproved such action, since it would increase the daily cost to the government to a total of from 25,000 to 30,000 livres, signed the measure to please the people and to "merit its confidence". The electors, however, were unwilling to go so far, and voted that the price should be thirteen and one-half sous. Even this concession was burdensome, because, owing to the disorder and especially to the armed intervention of the faubourgs, the collection of the octroi could not be fully reestablished, so that three weeks later the government was losing about 40,000 livres a week².

After the victory of Paris over the king and his advisers the city became a power greater than the prostrate and disorganized monarchy, and for a time the rival of the National Assembly itself. Towns, particularly those in its neighborhood, asked for authority to form a citizen guard or to reorganize their government. The

¹ *Ibid.*, 185, 353-354, 367-368. Cf. *Révolutions de Paris*, no. IV, pp. 9-11. The committee of police forbade publications of engravings that had not been approved by Robin, of the Academy of Painting and Sculpture. *Journal de Paris*, August 3.

² *Procès-verbal*, II, 168-169, 256-268, 283-285, 432-433; Bailly, *Mémoires*, II, 96-98, 148, 252; Gorsas, *Courrier de Versailles*, no. XVI. On August 20 threats were made in the Faubourg Saint-Antoine to oppose force by force if the municipality attempted an effective collection. *Actes*, I, 288-289. Smugglers and petty traders, and the poor generally, saw in these taxes an intolerable burden.

electors uniformly disclaimed jurisdiction and limited themselves to advice simply¹.

The period during which the electors directed the affairs of Paris was so short and so occupied either with the defense of the city and the restoration of order or with the puzzling question of giving themselves successors that there was little opportunity for purely municipal problems to be discussed. The antagonism which was later to arise between the central assembly and the district assemblies or between the central assembly and the mayor did not have time to develop. What appeared most clearly therefore was the determination of the Paris bourgeoisie to have some part in the management of their own affairs rather than await quietly the remedies which might be proposed in the States-General. It is also clear that the men they chose to represent them were conservative, partly it may be through a natural fear of assuming an unwonted responsibility, but partly also through a habitual respect for established authority. The curious way in which this respect is mingled with extreme revolutionary theories and sentiments is not the least interesting of the phenomena. No one can read the story of these days without thinking it fortunate that the electors had decided to remain in session after their proper work was completed, for, had they not been ready to assume direction, the confusion must have been far more serious and its results disastrous.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

¹For examples see *Procès-verbal*, II, 186-187, 192-193, 217, 219-220.

THE TREATY OF GUADALUPE-HIDALGO

THE treaty of peace with Mexico was signed February 2, 1848, at the town of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. It has appended to it the name of but one American, that of Nicholas P. Trist, who admitted that he had no authority at the time to represent the United States. The government at Washington had canceled his powers, denied his authority, and ordered him to leave the headquarters of the invading army and return home. Various views have been published regarding his actions. Trist has been called a far-sighted patriot, who by disobeying orders sacrificed his own reputation in order that he might put an end to the Mexican War and give to his country the legitimate fruits of victory. His motives have, on the other hand, been represented as based upon inordinate vanity, which blinded him to the manifest obligations of his mission and gave his name a distinction which his character by no means justified. It is the purpose of this paper to trace the history of the negotiations of which the Guadalupe-Hidalgo treaty was the result in the light of the mass of correspondence to be found in the archives of the Department of State, a part of which has never been printed. The diary of James K. Polk, a manuscript copy of which is in the Lenox Library, New York, furnishes a running commentary upon the peace negotiations, and by it the President of fifty years ago takes us into his confidence as fully as he did his own cabinet.¹

The history of the Mexican War, aside from the purely military part of it, has been written chiefly as a chapter in the history of the slavery question. The momentous national issues which pressed for attention even before Polk retired from office have given a twist to the many accounts of the period from 1845 to 1848. Books appearing soon after the event, animated not by a spirit of unbiased historical investigation, but written with the professed purpose of presenting a brief against the aggressions of slavery, have furnished in large measure the materials for the history of the period. The treatment of the subject of the Mexican War in the "reviews" of Jay² and

¹ Acknowledgment is here made to the authorities of the Lenox Library for permission to use parts of Polk's diary.

² William Jay, *A Review of the Causes and Consequences of the Mexican War* (Boston, 1849).

Livermore¹, well-constructed as they were and widely distributed, and fortified by an examination of published documents and newspapers, has grown into the narrative of Von Holst.

When Congress was told that by the act of Mexico there existed a state of war, and that Santa Anna was permitted to pass into Vera Cruz, Polk and his advisers were convinced that the war would be a short one, perhaps not ninety days in length. The diary informs us that when Polk came into office he had already made up his mind to acquire California. A plan developed by which he believed the acquisition might be made by peaceful negotiation. Claims against Mexico, under discussion as far back as Jackson's time, furnished the groundwork of the plan; the joint resolution annexing Texas gave the President something to build upon. By that act the determination of the boundaries of Texas rested with the United States. Mexico could not pay the claims in cash; the Texan boundary was unsettled. The idea of territorial indemnity was an irresistible conclusion: let her pay in land.

Two weeks after Polk was inaugurated, a secret agent, William S. Parrott, left Washington for Mexico to prepare a way for the reopening of diplomatic relations. By autumn the reports of the agent led Polk to believe that Mexico would receive a representative from the United States. John Black, the United States consul at the City of Mexico, wrote to Buchanan that he had positive and official assurance that the Mexican ministry was favorable to an adjustment of the questions in dispute between the two republics. The consul's letter was received November 9; on the tenth John Slidell, who had been selected by Polk two months previously,² was sent upon "one of the most delicate and important [missions] which has ever been confided to a citizen of the United States", one which, if successful, Buchanan told him, would establish for the envoy "an enviable reputation" and do an "immense service" for his country.³ This was no sham mission. Parrott, the secret agent, had reported that Mexico would not fight. The notoriously peaceful proclivities of the Mexican president, Herrera, warranted the hope that some sort of a settlement might be quickly arranged. "An Envoy possessing suitable qualifications for this Court", wrote Parrott, "might with comparative ease,

¹ Abiel Abbot Livermore, *The War with Mexico Reviewed* (Boston, 1850).

² Buchanan to Slidell, September 17, 1845; Slidell to Buchanan, September 25, 1845. See George Ticknor Curtis, *Life of James Buchanan*, I, 591.

³ Buchanan to Slidell, November 10, 1845; called for by resolution of the House, January 4, 1848, and refused by Polk, January 13, 1848; see H. Ex. Doc. 60, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 770; also No. 25, p. 1; printed in S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 71, with the correspondence concerning the treaty of peace with Mexico.

settle, *over a breakfast*, the most important national question.”¹ The instructions to John Slidell covered more than Mexico anticipated. No sooner had the envoy appeared in Vera Cruz than broadsides scattered over the City of Mexico told of his plans: to negotiate with the Mexican government for the sale of Texas, New Mexico, and the Californias.² Such in fact were Slidell’s instructions. He was authorized to assume the claims, fix the boundary of the United States at the Rio Grande, and obtain the cession of New Mexico and Upper California for a sum not to exceed twenty-five millions of dollars.³ The administration of Herrera, weaker even than most revolutionary governments in Mexico, was accused of a traitorous attempt at the disintegration of the country. To save itself from revolution it refused to receive Slidell because his powers were too great, since he was named as minister instead of as commissioner *ad hoc* to settle the Texas question, and by so doing Herrera countered Polk’s policy. The refusal, however, did not improve the situation. The peaceful Herrera gave way to the warlike Paredes. Polk, in anticipation of Slidell’s ultimate failure, ordered Taylor to the Rio Grande. Instead of calling Slidell home, he was directed to make further efforts to obtain recognition. Buchanan wrote to Slidell, March 12, 1846⁴:

The Oregon question is rapidly approaching a crisis. By the Steam Packet which will leave Liverpool on the 4th April, if not by that which left on the 4th instant, the President expects information which will be decisive on the subject. The prospect is that our differences with Great Britain may be peacefully adjusted, though this is by no means certain. Your return to the United States before the result is known, would produce considerable alarm in the public mind and might possibly exercise an injurious influence on our relations with Great Britain.

By the time this letter was read by Slidell he had exhausted all pretexts for remaining in Mexico and was on his way home. The plan of acquiring California by peaceful means was a failure.

¹ Parrott to Buchanan, August 26, 1845, received September 16, 1845. MS., Department of State Archives, Despatches, Mexico, vol. 12. It will be noticed that this letter from Parrott was received the day before Buchanan wrote to Slidell, offering him the Mexican mission.

² A copy of this broadside, called *La Voz del Pueblo*, was sent to Buchanan by Slidell. It bears date of December 3, 1845, and is headed: “La traicion se ha descubierto! . . . Mr. Slidell, ministro nombrado por los Estados-Unidos, para arreglar con el gobierno actual la venta de Tejas, Nuevo-Mexico y las Californias.” Slidell’s first letter from the City of Mexico, dated December 17, 1845, was received by Buchanan January 12, 1846. Taylor was ordered to the Rio Grande the following day.

³ Buchanan to Slidell, November 10, 1845, S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 71.

⁴ Buchanan to Slidell, March 12, 1846, MS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Department of State, Instructions, Mexico, vol. 16, p. 43.

"War . . . exists by the act of Mexico", Polk informed Congress May 11, 1846. Immediately orders were issued to permit Santa Anna, then in exile and under sentence of death, to pass into Vera Cruz¹. A great war was not contemplated, but a war just big enough to realize the plan of territorial indemnity. Santa Anna, it had been reported to the President, would make certain concessions rather than see Mexico ruled by a foreign prince; he preferred a friendly arrangement to the ravages of war. Santa Anna passed the American blockade; Vera Cruz received him as a hero, and he proceeded to the capital as the savior of the nation. By the middle of August he was in command of the Mexican forces and president *ad interim* of the Mexican Republic. Hardly had he arrived at the City of Mexico when Buchanan's note was submitted to him, suggesting that peace negotiations be forthwith begun.² The offer was declined.³ Santa Anna as a military chieftain was not Santa Anna in exile. Buchanan's answer to the refusal was that henceforth the war would be prosecuted with vigor until Mexico offered to make terms.⁴ From now on the war was waged in earnest. It appeared no longer to be a little war. Scott took command of the army, and the storm-center shifted from the northern provinces to Vera Cruz. And yet Mexico gave no sign of a desire for peace. Polk therefore was again compelled to make overtures for settlement, and this time by offering a specific proposition. In January Buchanan wrote to the Mexican minister of foreign affairs that although making "a renewed overture for peace" might "be regarded by the world as too great a concession to Mexico, yet he" was "willing to subject himself to this reproach". If Mexico so agreed he would send commissioners either to Havana or to Jalapa clothed with full powers to conclude a treaty of peace and given authority to suspend hostilities and raise blockades as soon as the Mexican commissioners met them.⁵ The Mexican answer was in spirit like its predecessors: Mexico would appoint commissioners as suggested, but not until the blockades were raised and all the territory of the Mexican Republic evacuated by the invading army.⁶ Such an answer was tantamount to a refusal, and so Polk considered it. When, in the middle of April, news of the fall of Vera Cruz reached Washington, it

¹ George Bancroft to Commodore David Conner, May 13, 1846, H. Ex. Doc. 25, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 5.

² Buchanan to the Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, July 27, 1846, *Congressional Globe*, 29 Congress, 2 Session, Appendix, 24.

³ The Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs to Buchanan, August 31, 1846, *ibid.*

⁴ Buchanan to same, September 26, 1846, *ibid.*

⁵ Buchanan to same, January 18, 1847, S. Ex. Doc. 1, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 36.

⁶ Monasterio to Buchanan, February 22, 1847, *ibid.*, 37.

was thought that Santa Anna could no longer refuse to negotiate, for the American arms were everywhere victorious, and Scott's army was on the march toward the capital.

Now was the time, in Polk's strange phrase, to "conquer a peace". Buchanan informed Mexico that the offer to negotiate would not be renewed (strong language until the context is heard) until the President had reason to believe that it would be accepted by the Mexican government. "The President . . . devoted . . . to honorable peace", so wrote Buchanan to the Mexican minister of foreign affairs,¹ "is determined that the evils of the war shall not be protracted one day longer than shall be rendered absolutely necessary by the Mexican republic. For the purpose of carrying this determination into effect with the least possible delay, he will forthwith send to the head-quarters of the army in Mexico, Nicholas P. Trist, esq., the officer next in rank to the undersigned in our department of foreign affairs, as a commissioner, invested with full powers to conclude a definite treaty of peace with the United Mexican States." Thus did Polk act upon a plan for negotiation by an agent not confirmed by the Senate, a method quite without precedent or parallel. The appointment of public commissioners might only subject the United States to the indignity of another refusal and give the Mexicans encouragement in their opinion concerning the President's motives for desiring the termination of the war. Influenced by these considerations, he hit upon the plan of sending "to the head-quarters of the army a confidential agent, fully acquainted with the views of this government, and clothed with full powers to conclude a treaty of peace with the Mexican government, should it be so inclined". He would be enabled in that case "to take advantage, at the propitious moment, of any favorable circumstances which might dispose that government to peace".² In the selection of this agent the President again proceeded upon altogether unusual lines. General Scott is authority for the statement that Polk wanted Silas Wright to undertake the mission, intimating that Scott would be Wright's associate.³ This was surely a strange selection, for Wright was a well-known advocate of the Wilmot Proviso, and Scott was personally obnoxious to the President. "Scott", said Polk, "is utterly unqualified for such a business."⁴ No man of national prominence could be expected to assume the rôle of a confidential

¹ Buchanan to Mexican Minister of Foreign Affairs, April 15, 1847, *ibid.*, 38-39. Also in Raphael Semmes, *Service Afloat and Ashore, during the Mexican War*, 303-306.

² Buchanan to Trist, April 15, 1847, S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 81.

³ Scott's *Autobiography*, II, 576.

⁴ Polk's diary, July 15, 1847.

agent to accompany the army and jump at a propitious moment to conclude a treaty. The chief clerk of Buchanan's department, personally little known to the President, was selected for the mission, a man with but meager training in diplomatic affairs, anything but robust in health, irritable, suspicious, timid, and, moreover, given to great verbosity of statement.

Nicholas Philip Trist was a Virginian by birth and was for a time a cadet at West Point. He did not graduate, however, but began the study of law under Jefferson, whose granddaughter he had married. At twenty-eight he was a clerk in the Treasury Department when Jackson selected him as his private secretary. After a short service in that capacity he was consul at Havana for eight years, whence he was recalled on the ground that he had aided the slave-trade.¹ Soon after the beginning of Polk's administration, he was made chief clerk of the State Department, and during his service there he appeared as a hard-working administrative officer in the department presided over by the somewhat timid Buchanan and really directed by the energetic Polk. The chief clerk gave evidence of uncompromising loyalty to the President and thorough sympathy with his plans. His selection for this delicate mission was probably due not so much to Polk's overestimation of Trist's diplomatic abilities as to an underestimate of the difficulties of the undertaking. It had appeared a simple thing to send Slidell to Mexico as the representative of a strong power to strike a bargain, through claims and a bonus, for the cession of New Mexico and California—how could so "feeble and distracted a nation as Mexico" refuse a liberal cash offer? The answer to that question had been war. Now that Congress had placed three millions of dollars in Polk's hands for the "speedy and honorable conclusion of the war", the President seemed to think that to negotiate a peace treaty upon terms dictated by himself was a mere clerical act for an agent accompanying a victorious army.

Whatever may have been the oral instructions which Trist received from the President, the official letter from Buchanan gave him small discretionary powers. Trist was handed a project of a treaty, and with it the statement that the extension of the boundaries of the United States over New Mexico and Upper California was to be considered a *sine qua non* of any treaty. What Buchanan had authorized Slidell to do before the war began was now, thanks to

¹ Trist was commissioned consul at Havana April 24, 1833. Tyler ordered his recall June 22, 1841. There is a mass of correspondence connecting Trist with aiding the slave-trade attached to a complaint from Fox to Forsyth, February 12, 1840; MS. Notes from British Legation to the Department of State.

the victorious advance of the army, made an ultimatum. Trist was authorized to pay in addition to the claims not more than twenty millions for the cession of New Mexico and Upper California; not more than five millions additional for Lower California; while the right of transit and passage over Tehuantepec was held to be worth another five millions, the consideration to be paid in annual instalments of three millions each. In any event the southwestern boundary was, of course, to be the Rio Grande. What Slidell had been authorized to offer twenty-five millions for, Trist was instructed to secure for twenty. The provisions as to Lower California and the right of transit over Tehuantepec were new, no mention of them having been made when Slidell was sent upon his mission. The projet accompanying Trist's instructions contained eleven articles covering the points just referred to. The third article provided that as soon as the treaty was ratified by Mexico, the military and naval commanders of both sides should be informed of the action as quickly as possible, after which an immediate suspension of hostilities should take place. Such was the expression of Polk's idea of "conquering a peace". Pending the negotiations of peace the United States was not to bind itself to discontinue offensive operations against Mexico; hostilities were not to cease until Mexico had actually ratified the peace treaty upon our own terms.¹

The confidential agent and commissioner left the capital for Mexico, and soon Buchanan began to receive Trist's long and tediously circumstantial communications. From New Orleans he wrote a dozen pages minutely describing his trip and the dangers of the journey from Mobile thither. Arrived at Vera Cruz, May 6, he quickly despatched two more reports, filled with his views upon the officers of the army and things in general. Illness seems to have held him for a while, as his next letter is from Jalapa, dated two weeks later. By this time he was involved in a high-tempered and wordy epistolary quarrel with the commanding general. Trist had been directed by Buchanan to communicate his instructions in confidence to Scott and to deliver to him Buchanan's letter for transmission to the Mexican minister of foreign affairs. Instead of waiving formalities and putting himself on friendly and confidential terms with Scott, Trist immediately on his arrival at Vera Cruz sent the American commander a note inclosing the letter from Buchanan sealed and with it orders from Marcy. Scott was ever suspicious of the administration at Washington, and now he opened the vials of his wrath upon the commissioner. He was ordered by the secretary

¹ Buchanan's projet, S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 85-89.

of war to yield to Trist the right to decide upon the suspension of military operations. It is doubtful if a more astounding order was ever sent to a commanding officer in the field, and Scott replied to Trist that the secretary of war proposed to degrade him by requiring that he, as commander of the army, should defer to the chief clerk of the Department of State the question of continuing or discontinuing hostilities.¹ Consequently Scott returned the sealed letter from the Department of State and, as a purely military question, declined to obey the order of the secretary of war, unless Trist was clothed with military rank over him. The next month was spent by the commissioner in writing voluminous letters to Scott, which the latter answered in kind. Trist lectured the general upon his lack of respect for the commissioner sent by the President. Scott replied that Trist's letter was such a farrago of insolence, conceit, and arrogance as to be a choice specimen of diplomatic literature and manners. "The Jacobin convention of France never sent to one of its armies in the field a more amiable and accomplished instrument. If you were armed with an ambulatory guillotine, you would be the personification of Danton, Marat, and St. Just, all in one."² On June 4 Scott wrote to Marcy, asking to be recalled, owing to the many "cruel disappointments and mortifications" he had "been made to feel since" leaving "Washington, and the total want of support and sympathy on the part of the War Department"³. The administration responded with orders to each to cease the disgraceful quarrel and to join in carrying out the plans of the government.

Much of this quarrel doubtless had its origin in politics. The military history of the Mexican War is largely made up of jealousy and its consequent wrangles, which, ending in arrests and courts-martial, were transferred from the field of operations to Washington. "The truth is", Polk wrote in his diary, June 12, "I have been compelled from the beginning to conduct the war against Mexico through the agency of two generals, highest in rank, who have not only no sympathies with the government, but are hostile to my administration. Both of them have assumed to control the government. To this I will not submit and will as certainly remove General Scott from the chief command as he shall refuse or delay to obey the order borne him by Mr. Trist."⁵ For some time, however,

¹ Scott to Trist, May 7, 1847, *ibid.*, 157-159.

² Scott to Trist, May 29, 1847, *ibid.*, 172.

³ Scott to Marcy, June 4, 1847, *ibid.*, 129-131.

⁴ Marcy to Scott, July 12, 1847, *ibid.*, 131; Buchanan to Trist, July 13, 1847, *ibid.*,

113.

⁵ Polk's diary, June 12, 1847.

as their despatches show, Trist and Scott continued their unseemly altercation. "Between them", the diary says, "the orders of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State have been disregarded and the danger has become imminent that the golden moment for concluding a peace with Mexico may have passed."¹ The President was for recalling both Scott and Trist, but the cabinet was unanimous in the opinion that it would be bad policy to do so. Realizing Trist's inefficiency, Polk then suggested that Soulé or Jefferson Davis be associated with him, but nothing came of the suggestion.²

Writing from Puebla, June 13, Trist stated that he had had no intercourse with Scott for a month, although he had been near him for more than that time. His next letter, dated July 7, in which he is supposed to have given his reasons for making peace with the general, was never received at Washington. Scott made no report to the secretary of war from June 4 to July 25. At that time each asked that the correspondence relating to the quarrel be suppressed.⁴ What caused the reconciliation, so far as their letters show, must remain a mystery. During the time in which Trist and Scott were quarreling, Trist asked the British minister, Bankhead, and Thornton, the British secretary of legation, to transmit to the Mexican authorities Buchanan's letter, which Scott had refused to receive. Bankhead and Thornton readily acquiesced in his request and forwarded the letter to Ibarra, the acting minister of foreign affairs. In a few days the commissioner received through the same channel of communication the answer of the Mexican government. It was that the determination of the question of peace must rest with the Mexican congress.⁵

So far there was no reason to believe the way open for negotiations. Santa Anna sent a message to congress in which he peremptorily ordered it to state whether or not any propositions for peace should be listened to.³ When the Mexican congress scattered and made no answer to the message, Santa Anna informed Mackintosh, the British consul at the City of Mexico, that as he was abandoned by congress, he must, as military chief, endeavor to make

¹ *Ibid.*

² *Ibid.*, July 9, 1847.

³ Trist to Buchanan, June 13, 1847, S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 178-181.

⁴ Scott to Marcy, July 25, 1847: "Since about the 26th ultimo, our intercourse has been frequent and cordial; and I have found him [Trist] able, discreet, courteous, and amiable." *Ibid.*, 135. Trist to Buchanan, July 23, 1847: Scott's "character I now believe that I had entirely misconceived." *Ibid.*, 302.

⁵ Ibarra to Trist, June 22, 1847.

⁶ Santa Anna to the Mexican Congress, July 16, 1847. S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 302-305.

peace.¹ His secret agents then intimated to Trist that while nothing could be done without the use of money, yet if a million dollars were placed in his hands at the conclusion of the peace and ten thousand immediately, commissioners would be sent to meet the American commissioner and negotiations begun.² It was at this juncture that Scott and Trist began to be upon the most friendly terms, and Trist was a welcome guest at Scott's headquarters. Trist reported to Buchanan, upon the authority of Thornton, that Santa Anna would let Scott advance close to the City of Mexico and then negotiate.³ What was not reported was that Scott paid the ten thousand dollars of earnest-money after consultation with his officers.⁴ The matter did not come to Polk's attention until December, when General Pillow, enraged at what Polk called Scott's persecution of that officer, wrote of it to the President.⁵ Scott reported the expenditures as those for secret service and asserted that he had never tempted the honor or patriotism of any man, but held it as lawful in morals as in war to purchase valuable information or services voluntarily tendered him.⁶ "General Scott's answer is evasive", is the entry in the diary, "and leaves the irresistible inference that such a transaction took place and that it will not bear the light."⁷ Writing to Buchanan, July 23, Trist copied a letter received by him from an unnamed source. Trist's correspondent, in whom undoubtedly the commissioner placed great confidence, wrote: "Santa Anna is afraid to make peace now and cannot. M———⁸ can do nothing with him, even with the aid he possesses from you. S. A. now says se-

¹ Thornton to Trist, July 29, 1847, MS. copy, Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Department of State.

² Ripley's *War with Mexico*, II, 148-170; Polk's diary, December 18, 1847.

³ Trist to Buchanan, July 23, 1847, MS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Department of State.

⁴ Ripley's *War with Mexico*, II, 148-170. General Shields, however, told Polk that Trist was not present at the conference. Polk's diary, December 28, 1847.

⁵ Polk's diary, February 16, 1848: "The chief clerk of the War Department brought to me today a letter received from Majr. Genl. Pillow, dated at the City of Mexico on the 18th. of January in answer to a letter of the Secretary of War addressed to him in relation to certain proceedings of General Scott and Mr. Trist at Puebla in July last concerning an attempt to use money without any authority or sanction of the government, to bribe the authorities in Mexico, to secure peace. This letter discloses some astounding facts in relation to that infamous transaction and must lead to a further investigation." In the letters-received book of the War Department is the following entry under date of March 31, 1848: "Pillow, Maj. Genl. G. J., Mexico, Jany. 18, 1848. In answer to letter of Sec. War Dec. 24, 1847 and relates to negotiations carried on at Puebla in July and Aug. 47." The letter referred to cannot be found in the War Department.

⁶ Scott to Marcy, February 6, 1848. H. Ex. Doc. 60, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 1085. There is some discrepancy in the date.

⁷ Polk's diary, February 19, 1848.

⁸ Mackintosh?

cretly that he shall allow your army to approach this city [Mexico], even as far as the Peñon, and then endeavour to make peace."¹ The advance of the army, however, was by no means unobstructed. The decisive victory at Contreras, followed by that at Churubusco, opened the way to the capital. Instead of pushing on to clinch the former victories, as the rules of military science would seem to have dictated, Scott halted his army and proposed an armistice. Was this done, as Scott said, lest the elements of peace might be scattered, or was it with the expectation that Santa Anna, with a part of the consideration cash in hand, would carry out the balance of the bargain? Through the good offices of Thornton, who with Bankhead and Mackintosh played a large part in all these negotiations, the armistice became effective August 24. Santa Anna appointed as commissioners four well-known peace men to meet the American commissioner.

The opportunity for which Trist had been waiting since May was now presented. Santa Anna's commissioners met him as agreed. No further evidence of Trist's utter incapacity is needed than his own account of the conferences. Two days before the first meeting he made known to Santa Anna that in order to secure the boundary defined in his projet, with the right of transit over the isthmus, he was authorized and willing to go as high as the highest sum named in his instructions. This amount, he said, might be paid in such a way as to enable Santa Anna to convert all of it into cash as soon as the treaty was ratified.² Such an unfortunate admission had the result he might have expected. Santa Anna's commissioners submitted a counter-projet conceding nothing but Upper California north of the thirty-seventh parallel, for which the United States was expected to assume the claims and pay a bonus³. The Mexican commissioners insisted on the Nueces as a boundary, declaring that if peace were established it must be at that river. Trist hesitated and then offered to refer the question to Washington, thereby proposing to extend the armistice for at least forty-five days.⁴ No more flagrant disobedience of orders was ever committed. The war had been begun and waged upon the theory that the Rio Grande was the ancient boundary of Texas. What persuaded Trist to submit the matter for further instructions is incomprehensible. He himself

¹Trist to Buchanan, July 23, 1847, P. S., July 25. MS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Despatches, Mexico, Vol. 14.

²Trist to Buchanan, September 4, 1847, MS., Bureau of Indexes and Archives, Department of State.

³S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 339.

⁴The Mexican Commissioners to the Minister of Relations, September 7, 1847, *Ibid.*, 344-346.

explained it by saying that the Mexican commissioners led him to believe that a part of New Mexico would be ceded if the Nueces were accepted as a boundary. There was no reasonable foundation in fact, however, for any such belief, for Mexico demanded Trist's decision within three days upon the counter-projet, by the terms of which New Mexico was to remain a Mexican province. Before that short time had elapsed Santa Anna's violations of the armistice became so notorious that Scott gave notice of its termination. The American army moved toward the capital and entered it only after two of the bloodiest battles of the war. Santa Anna's army was scattered and without a leader. Notwithstanding all this, Trist was blind to Santa Anna's duplicity. As late as September 27 he wrote that he was perfectly convinced of Santa Anna's sincere desire for peace, but that peace was an impossibility upon the terms of Buchanan's instructions.¹ The armistice was a strategic blunder, giving Santa Anna opportunity to mass his forces for the defense of the capital, and the heavy losses suffered by Scott's army at Molino del Rey were the price paid for it. The overtures for peace displayed the gullibility of Trist, whose persistent belief that Santa Anna once bought would stay bought led him to ignore his instructions and to disobey Polk's most positive orders.

Before Trist's reports of his inglorious conferences reached Washington, Polk had read the Mexican accounts of the affair sent from Vera Cruz. The President at once ordered Trist's recall. "Mr. Trist is recalled", says the diary, "because his remaining longer with the army could not probably accomplish the objects of his mission, and because his remaining longer might and probably would impress the Mexican government with the belief that the United States are so anxious for peace, that they would ultimate[ly] conclude one upon Mexican terms. Mexico must now sue for peace and when she does, we will hear her proposition."² Trist's actions had surely merited his recall, but Polk's policy of continually making overtures, first by a series of notes suggesting peace and finally by sending a commissioner, gave Mexico exactly the belief which Polk attributed to Trist's blundering efforts alone. The policy was ill-advised and its instrument incompetent.

The occupation of the City of Mexico, September 14, completely changed the complexion of affairs. Two days later Santa Anna resigned the presidency, and by so doing removed the one great obstacle to peace. Within a week after Santa Anna's abdication

¹ Trist to Buchanan, September 27, 1847, *ibid.*, 201.

² Polk's diary, October 5, 1847. Trist's despatch of September 4 was received October 21.

plans were well under way for the reorganization of the government under the auspices of well-known *moderados*. Before it had been accomplished Trist again asked the Mexican commissioners to meet him. A month elapsed before he had an answer, and he asked Buchanan for permission to return home, as the weakness of the new government might keep him "hanging here for an indefinite period" without accomplishing anything.¹ Buchanan's letter of recall reached Trist November 16. Trist acknowledged it, waived for the moment any defense of his actions, and stated that he would start home at once. Following hard upon the receipt of his recall Trist received word, again through Thornton, that the new Mexican administration had appointed commissioners.² He replied, November 24, that, as he was about to return to the United States, whatever overtures Mexico desired to make would be forwarded through Scott to Washington.³ Despite this statement and notwithstanding his orders to return, he began immediately to negotiate with the Mexican commissioners upon the basis of his original instructions. The reasons for this change in plans are set forth in a letter of sixty pages written December 6.⁴ This letter was certainly of a character to arouse the President's indignation. The diary describes it as "impudent, arrogant, very insulting to the government and personally offensive to the President". The writer of it was "destitute of honor or principle and contemptibly base". "It is manifest to me", wrote Polk, "that he has become the tool of General Scott and his menial instrument and that the paper was written at Scott's instance and direction. I directed the Secretary of War to write to Major General Butler [who had superseded Scott], directing him, if Mr. Trist was still with the headquarters of the army, to order him off and to inform the authorities of Mexico that he had no authority to treat."⁵ Scott, writing at the same time, said: "No proposition has been made to me, looking to a peace, by the federal government of this republic, or its commissioners; the latter understood to be still in this city. I have not seen them."⁶

This long despatch of Trist's doubtless justified Polk's suspicion that Scott instigated it. While Trist said that the government would be left at liberty to disavow his act, he set forth his reasons for

¹ Trist to Buchanan, October 31, 1847, S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 213.

² Thornton to Trist, November 22, 1847, and to Peña y Peña, November 24, 1847, *ibid.*, 231.

³ Trist to Peña y Peña, November 24, 1847, *ibid.*

⁴ Trist to Buchanan, December 6, 1847, received January 15, 1848, *ibid.*, 231-266

⁵ Polk's diary, January 15, 1848.

⁶ Scott to Marcy, December 4, 1847, H. Ex. Doc. 60, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 1033-1035.

reopening negotiations as: 1, that peace was still the desire of the President; 2, that unless he seized the opportunity offered, no other chance for peace would remain; 3, that the boundaries stipulated in his instructions were as much as Mexico would ever yield; and 4, that his recall was based upon a supposed state of facts the reverse of the truth. Underlying all of his arguments in support of these reasons is the thinly-disguised innuendo that the President had changed his plans and now favored the annexation of all Mexico. In other words, Trist proceeded to make a treaty embodying Polk's original idea of territorial indemnity with the express intention of throwing upon the President the unpleasant alternative of either accepting the treaty or rejecting it. If Polk rejected it, he must bear the odium of seeking to annihilate Mexico as a nation and of renewing a war which was now unpopular. If he accepted it, he would then, according to Trist's belief, sacrifice his cherished wish, the conquest of the whole of Mexico. Such is the import of this unique despatch. Trist's assumption that Polk desired the absorption of all Mexico has been proved to be baseless.¹ Reasonably enough, the President felt that the amount of money to be paid Mexico for the cession should be less than would have been the case had the war ceased seven months before. Pillow was in favor of greater territorial indemnity and claimed while in Mexico to be the President's mouthpiece. Trist shared Scott's hatred of that officer, and the parts of the despatch not directly or by inference attacking Polk are filled with venom against Pillow.

Before Butler had an opportunity to carry out Polk's order, Trist had signed the treaty and sent it on its way to Washington. There are no detailed accounts of the conferences of which the treaty was the result. We know that for two months Trist met the commissioners daily, that the original projet was taken as a basis for the negotiation, and that there was apparently little difficulty in agreeing upon boundaries. The question of claims and of the condition of the inhabitants of the ceded territory occupied most of the meetings. The result was in hand February 2, 1848, when Trist met the Mexican commissioners to sign the treaty at Guadalupe-Hidalgo, "a spot", said Trist, "which, agreeably to the creed of this country, is the most sacred on earth, as being the scene of the miraculous appearance of the Virgin, for the purpose of declaring that Mexico was taken under her special protection".²

Seventeen days later Polk had in his hands the grant of territory

¹ "The United States and Mexico, 1847-1848", by Professor E. G. Bourne, in *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, V, 491-502, April, 1900.

² Trist to Buchanan, February 2, 1848, S. Ex. Doc. 52, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 102.

which he had hoped to obtain through the peaceful negotiations of Slidell. The Rio Grande was acknowledged as the boundary of Texas; New Mexico and Upper California were ours; and the sum to be paid was that named in Trist's instructions: the treaty included all of Polk's *sine qua non*. That the right of transit over Tehuantepec was not included was a small matter, for the recent treaty with New Granada afforded a better route to the Pacific. Benton's comment upon the treaty was that it was a fortunate event for the United States and especially for Polk's administration. "The Congress elections were going against the administration, and the aspirants for the presidency in the cabinet were struck with terror at the view of the great military reputations which were growing up."¹

Haste in acting upon the treaty was of the utmost importance for two reasons: first, that the treaty might be returned to Mexico for ratification before the Mexican government should be overthrown; and second, that the growing sentiment for "all of Mexico", both in the cabinet and out of it, a sentiment to which the President was opposed, might be effectually stifled.² Polk made up his mind at once not to reject the treaty because of Trist's conduct. His desire for peace was so great that he did not permit himself to be influenced by his indignation at Trist's insulting letters. He decided, after stating his views to the cabinet, to send the document to the Senate, suggesting certain amendments and by so doing show a "magnanimous forbearance toward Mexico". Every member of the Senate committee on foreign relations, with the exception of the chairman, Sevier, was at first opposed to ratification. The reason for their attitude, as reported by the chairman to Polk, was not the terms of the treaty, but Trist's lack of authority to negotiate. "I told Sevier", the diary records, "that the treaty was the subject for consideration, not Trist's conduct and that if the provisions of the treaty were such as would be accepted, it would be worse than an idle ceremony to send out a grand commission to re-negotiate the same treaty."³ The Senate committee reported the treaty without amendment on the same day, and after two weeks' discussion the Senate first amended and then ratified it by a vote of thirty-eight to fourteen. The most important of the amendments was made at the suggestion of the

¹ Benton's *Thirty Years' View*, II, 710.

² Professor Bourne's article as cited. The treaty arrived in Washington February 19; Polk decided to send it to the Senate for ratification February 21. Polk's diary, February 21, 1848. Calhoun wrote to Clemson, March 7, 1848: "The greatest danger is, that the [Mexican] Government may not hold together until the treaty is exchanged. Nothing but the countenance of our Government, and the support of capitalists interested in preserving it, can continue it in existence. It is, indeed, but the shadow of a Government." *Report of American Historical Association*, 1899, II, 746.

³ Polk's diary, February 28, 1848.

President, and by it the tenth article, relating to the disposition of the public lands in Texas, was stricken out. An additional secret article, delaying for eight months the time of Mexico's ratification, was for obvious reasons omitted by a unanimous vote. Sevier and Clifford, the latter Polk's attorney-general, were appointed commissioners in accordance with the provision of the treaty permitting the exchange of ratifications at the City of Mexico. As their duties were merely the gaining of Mexico's consent to the Senate's amendments, and the hastening of final ratification, their task was light. As soon as it was known that the Senate was modifying the terms of the agreement as signed, the Mexican government ceased all efforts for ratification until the nature of the amendments was known. A few days after the arrival of Sevier and Clifford at Mexico with the amended treaty, the Mexican congress agreed to ratification by practically a unanimous vote.

There was no glory in all this for Trist. Polk characterized him as an "impudent and unqualified scoundrel". Upon his arrival at Washington the former chief clerk of the State Department found the doors closed to him. He could get the ear of no one, and after vainly trying for some time to collect his salary after the date of his recall, he left Washington. Insisting on having a hearing, he addressed a long communication to the speaker of the House August 7, 1848, accusing the President of high crimes and misdemeanors, including subornation of perjury, and suggesting that Polk be impeached.¹ But there was no need for stirring up the matter in the hope of finding political capital against Polk. The time had gone by for that. The letter was received during the last days of the session and referred to the committee on foreign affairs, and there it slept. The war was over; Polk's term was drawing to a close; and the country was in the midst of a presidential campaign. Trist was soon forgotten. The result of the election of 1848 was the choice of Taylor for President, one of the two great Whig generals who had reaped the political popularity which Polk had coveted. Scott was for the time passed by, and nobody had any consideration for the assertive and talkative commissioner who had made the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo. But the persistent Trist did not despair, and twenty-two years later he secured from Congress the reward for his successful presumption.² The feeble old man, who had been one of Jefferson's family and afterward the friend of Jackson, was at last secure in the belief that he had been vindicated by his government.

JESSE S. REEVES.

¹ *Congressional Globe*, 30 Congress, 1 Session, 1057-1058.

² Senate Report 261, 41 Congress, 2 Session.

MATERIALS IN BRITISH ARCHIVES FOR AMERICAN COLONIAL HISTORY¹

NOTWITHSTANDING the fact that for a hundred and fifty years our colonies were a part of the British empire, no systematic attempt has ever been made by British or American historians to discover the extent and value of the material contained in British archives relating to American history. Persistent and long search has frequently been made for documents bearing on a given subject or connected with the history of a given colony, but such investigation has usually been confined to well-known and fairly well-arranged collections, examination of which was comparatively easy and a successful result highly probable. Outlying sources, records relating to other than colonial subjects, and groups containing only occasional and isolated documents have remained largely unexplored; while even such compact and clearly defined collections as the Colonial Office papers have never been thoroughly and critically examined.

The time was therefore opportune for a more thoroughly organized attack upon the British records, and for the discovery, as far as human imperfection would allow, of all documents that directly or indirectly bear upon our history. Tedious though the work promised to be, it seemed to be justified by the possibility of obtaining even an approximate description of each isolated document, important or unimportant, and of each collection, great or small, that might some time be needed by future writers of our history.

The task was a large one, but two conditions proved eminently favorable to a rapid prosecution of the work: first, the concentration of the bulk of the material in a few great centers, like the British Museum and the Public Record Office; and secondly, the unfailing courtesy of the officials in charge as well as of many private individuals, who without exception did all in their power to promote the undertaking. In most cases, though not in all, the facilities for research are adequate for student purposes, and though hours seem short, notably at the Bodleian Library, the overzealous investigator is forced thereby to take a needed relaxation. Except occasionally in certain cases where the quarters are cramped and special search-rooms cannot be spared, the student will meet with few restrictions,

¹ This article is a preliminary report to the Bureau of Historical Research of the Carnegie Institution of Washington.

and will be able to employ his time to the best advantage. Private collections, of which there are many in England, are not so readily accessible, and in a number of instances are closed entirely. It is much to be regretted that so many official papers are at the present time in private hands; for though many of them have been dealt with in the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, it is well known that the earlier of these reports are in need of extended revision. Furthermore, many papers of an official character, which were deemed the private property of the official in authority at the time, have disappeared from view, and there seems to be no way of finding out whether they are in existence or not. A search for lost documents among private papers is a practical impossibility. One can only wish that more private collections would find their way into public depositories, either by gift or purchase, as in the case of the Hardwicke papers in the British Museum or the Shaftesbury papers in the Public Record Office.

The five depositories that may be deemed of first importance are the Bodleian Library, the British Museum, the Privy Council Office, the Royal Institution, and the Public Record Office. Other documents, though in no cases numerous, are in the archiepiscopal library at Lambeth, the episcopal library at Fulham, the library of Sion College, the library of the Geographical Society, and among the records of the Herald's office, the Old Bailey Proceedings, and the manuscripts in Somerset House and the Courts of Law. There are a few volumes relating to trade and to the Philippines in the India Office, which can be found in the catalogue of its manuscripts entitled, *Printed List of General Records, 1599 to 1879* (1902). A few papers, mostly duplicates, are to be found in the Owen Wynne collection in All Souls College, Oxford, and a few also in the Bibliotheca Pepysiana, Magdalene College, Cambridge. Of the latter a large number are copies of the Pepys papers in the Bodleian, but one manuscript volume is unique. It contains copies by Samuel Wiseman, "principal clerk to the Honorable Commissioners" who were sent to Virginia in 1676-1677, of all the documents connected with the work of that commission, many of which are not in the Public Record Office. Among the Pepys "Miscellanies" are also a number of papers relating to shipping and the plantations, among which are the report of the Council of Trade of 1660 to the king "concerning the Trade and Navigation of the kingdom," and one or two "Considerations" upon the Foreign Plantations, dated about 1684-1685. As was to have been expected, the Pepys papers relate largely to matters connected with the admiralty and the navy.

In the Bodleian Library the total number of documents relating

to American history is not large, and as a whole cannot be deemed of special importance. Some of them, however, are of value and serve to throw light into dark places and to extend our knowledge of matters hitherto imperfectly known. While there are a few groups of related documents, such as the Newman, Champante, and Clarendon papers, yet the majority have no connection with one another. Four only of the great collections, which have made the Bodleian Library justly famous, contain documents for our purpose: the Ashmolean, Tanner, Rawlinson (including the Pepys), and the Clarendon. Of these four, the first and second furnish scarcely a score of documents, while the third and fourth contain a very large number. The Ashmolean manuscripts give us the instructions to Gates and Lord Delaware and the procedure at the interment of William Lovelace¹; the Tanner, largely ecclesiastical in character and of a date not later than 1699, contain various papers and letters of Edward Randolph regarding the religious condition of New England, other similar letters from Massachusetts and Maryland, and the patent drawn up by Charles II for the erection of Virginia into a bishopric, of which another and slightly different copy is to be found among the Wynne papers. The Rawlinson Manuscripts, A, B, C, D, contain large numbers of papers of a miscellaneous character, from 1660 to about 1730. A contains many letters sent to Lord Arlington from America, and the papers which Pepys collected in order to clear himself from the charges of John Scott, among which is a petition, hitherto unknown, of John Winthrop for a charter for Connecticut. B has papers relating to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and its work of sending ministers to the colonies; and it also contains the large and very valuable collection of Champante papers, one hundred and thirty in number, relating to New York politics after 1700. C contains the papers of Henry Newman, secretary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and agent for New Hampshire, relating to that province; the Coxe papers (some of which are in A), which throw light on New Jersey; a large collection of log-books of ships; a mass of papers relating to the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in New England, with letters from John Eliot, Edward Winslow, Thomas Weld, and others, about 1651-1653; and other papers of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, of considerable importance for the churches in America, with letters from the governors and reports on the condition of religion there. D contains a few letters belonging to the Newman collection and copies of three letters from Thomas Newe, scholar of Exeter College,

¹ Printed in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, IX, 522 ff., April, 1904.

dated Charles Town, 1682, to his father, butler of the same college, giving an account of South Carolina. Many of the Clarendon papers have been printed in the *Collections* of the New York Historical Society and in Lister's *Life of Clarendon*, but there are others yet unprinted that show Clarendon's interest in colonies other than New York, as well as a series of papers of Clarendon's unworthy grandson, Cornbury, governor of New York. There are also many Downing letters, of which but few have to do with the colonies; copies of the proceedings at Boston between Massachusetts and the king's commissioners in 1665; and a copy of Maverick's *Description of New England*.

The number of documents in the British Museum relating to American history is enormous, and there is no royal road to their discovery. Great collections, such as the Newcastle, Bouquet, Haldimand, Auckland, Hardwicke, and Hutchinson papers, and a few marked volumes, such as Egerton, 2395, Additional Manuscripts, 33028-33030, 35907-35913, known to the officials in the manuscript-room, are easily found; and the great classified catalogue, arranged by subjects, directs attention to many particular documents. But when all these documents have been explored, there still remains a vast number of papers, to find which one must search the collection-catalogues. Pouring over catalogues and indexes is dreary work, and the task is the more difficult because the catalogue lists are frequently incomplete; and because some collections, such as the Newcastle and part of the Hardwicke papers, are not listed at all. If one is to be thorough, therefore, one must search not only in the classified catalogue and the collection-catalogues, but in the indexes also. To make the matter somewhat more complicated, older catalogues such as the Sloane, and groups of papers such as the Lauderdale, are undergoing rearrangement and renumbering, and in these, as in other cases, the classified catalogue is of no value. The task, therefore, of discovering isolated documents is not an easy one, and he would be a bold and self-confident investigator who after three months' labor dared say that he had discovered all.

Documents relating to American history are contained in one or other of nine great collections: Lansdowne, Harleian, Stowe, Sloane, Additional Manuscripts, Egerton, Hargrave, and Kings, with an occasional paper in Royal and in Egerton Biblical. Among the Lansdowne manuscripts are documents relating to the controversy in the church in Hartford in 1656, a portion of which are printed in the *Collections* of the Connecticut Historical Society; copies of a large number of papers sent from the Board of Trade

to Secretary Vernon in 1699 and relating to Nova Scotia and New York; Bishop Kennett's interleaved and annotated copy of the history of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, printed in 1706, and his commonplace-book, which contains copies of some important letters not to be found elsewhere; "An Alphabetical list of the names of authors of commercial books and pamphlets", containing 2,377 titles, of which 105 relat  to the plantations or to their trade; original Indian deeds from Connecticut; the summary of a dispute in New York over the title to lands of the Wappinger Indians; many colonial quit-rent statistics; letters and papers relating to East Florida; and a few Revolutionary documents. Among the Harleian manuscripts are a few log-books of ships, a number of papers on the tobacco trade of the plantations; an account of Endecott's cutting out the cross from the king's flag; papers regarding the Palatines; a manuscript of Donne's *Virginia Reviewed*; letters bearing on the proposed appointment of Alexander Murray as bishop of Virginia in 1673; Simon d' Ewes's very important notes on New England; and Penn's letters to John Fenwick. In the Stowe collection are valuable letters from William Stoughton of Massachusetts; a group of Georgia documents of 1742; an account of Nelson's expedition to Canada (1682); Lord Warwick's correspondence on New England, Virginia, etc., in 1646, 1648; the Dudley-Belcher correspondence relative to the Princess Sophia's gift of her portrait to the Massachusetts Bay Colony; and transcripts of a great number of papers relating to the Stamp Act, the originals of which may be found elsewhere. In the Deering correspondence is a letter from North Carolina (1703) similar to those of Newe from South Carolina.

The Sloane collection, in process of recataloguing, is contained in the first 5,017 volumes of the series, of which the Additional Manuscripts is the continuation. As might have been expected, these combined collections, numbering nearly 37,000 volumes, are amazingly rich in Americana, and it is impossible here to do more than hint at the valuable documents they contain. In some of the early Sloane volumes there is a series of valuable voyages to the "South Seas", that is, to the west coast of South America, Mexico, and California; in later volumes we find many scattered voyages and descriptions (of great value) of New England, Maryland, New York, and Virginia; and a large number of letters and documents sent to the Royal Society concerning the flora and fauna of the colonies. We meet with the letters of a score of colonials interested in natural history, which do not bear out Dr. Eggleston's charge that colonial science was largely unintelligent credulity.

The early volumes of the Additional Manuscripts collection contain a great number of papers bearing on the origin and activity of the Board of Trade and on trade in general. Of great importance are the Cary letters and papers, which throw light on the Parliamentary struggle preceding the appointment of the board in 1696. There is a letter relating to Occam and the Indian school at Lebanon, and there are several letters from William Keith regarding his *History of the British Plantations*, besides a volume full of material for the student of early Congregationalism in Holland. There is here, as elsewhere, a great number of "states and accounts" of considerable value for a study of the financial relations between England and her colonies, of the customs revenue and officials, and of the costs of troops sent to America. There is a large number of volumes that came from the dispersed library of George Chalmers, bought by Rodd, the bookseller, and sold to the Museum in the forties. These are of the highest value as having to do with the Board of Trade and with the colonies, and we can only wonder by what process they came into the library of Chalmers, since they belong to the Board of Trade papers. Did Chalmers "borrow" them? There are other volumes that throw light on the character of the business brought before the Council of Trade of 1660; four volumes devoted to boundary disputes in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and New York; three volumes made up from the Newcastle papers that deal entirely with America and the West Indies; seven volumes from the Hardwicke collection that relate wholly to trade and the American plantations; and one entire volume and part of another relating to the iron industry, chiefly in Maryland. It is unnecessary to speak here at length of the Newcastle papers, numbering more than 200 volumes, in which there are hundreds of letters and other documents from and about America; or of the Bouquet papers, 17 volumes, and the Haldimand papers, 231 volumes, both of which are listed in Brymner's *Canadian Archives*; or of the Hutchinson papers, 14 volumes, containing the correspondence, letter-book, and diary of Thomas Hutchinson, the papers of Andrew Oliver, and letters to and from others of the Hutchinson family, chiefly in England; or of the Auckland papers, 59 volumes, of great importance for the early Revolutionary period, when William Eden was under-secretary of state, and for the years 1777-1778, when he came to America as a member of the peace commission; or of the recently acquired Hardwicke papers, of between three and four hundred volumes, some of which are still unbound, containing, among other matters relating to the plantations, the

briefs of many cases of appeal from the colonies, during the period from 1721 to 1766.

In no way inferior, so far as its relation to American history is concerned, is the Egerton collection of about 2,700 volumes. Egerton, 2395, has long been known to American students, since Mr. Walters gave a brief account of it in the *New England Historical and Genealogical Register* fifteen years ago. Many of the documents in this volume have been printed, but some of the most important, among which are the Povey and Noell papers concerning the erection of a council of trade and plantations, have not been used. In other Egerton volumes are letters from William Leete regarding the condition of New Haven in 1653, and from George Fenwick of the Saybrook colony regarding the sale of that colony to Connecticut. There are also Downing letters in large numbers, but of comparatively little value; a minute of a meeting of the Council of Trade in 1663 and other papers connected with the Board of Trade; and finally the journal of John Knepp, midshipman in H. M. S. *Rose*, William Phips, commander, 1683, a document of great length and of great interest. In Egerton Biblical is an occasional document, such as Dummer's proposal that a colony of Scotsmen be permitted to settle in Canada; in the Royal Manuscripts is a copy of Rolfe's *True Relation*; and in Additional Charters is a confirmation of the charter to Germantown in 1718, an important paper on the trade of the Spaniard "about the Asiento and Galeons", and what appears to be the original grant of part of Virginia to Lord Hopton, in two skins, with ribbon and seal. The Hargrave collection contains a few papers, chiefly of a legal character, such as the case of the governor of Virginia versus the Burgesses, June 18, 1754; and other cases and opinions on disputes concerning customs, particularly in connection with Maryland (similar papers are found in two volumes of the Additional Manuscripts collection), Pennsylvania, in the quarrel between Penn and Quarry, and Connecticut, in its controversy with Mason and the Mohegan Indians. One elaborate paper deals with the "different laws and modes respecting the barring of entails in the several American colonies", of date about 1773. In the King's Manuscripts are Franklin's letters to Cooper (1769-1774); Pownall's letters to Cooper (1769-1774); Cooper's letters to Franklin (1769-1775); a report on the state of the American colonies, containing copies of letters from colonial governors and others of dates from 1721 to 1766; reports on the state of manufactures, on the modes of granting land, and on the fees of office, received in answer to circulars sent out by the Board of Trade in 1766; descriptions of Nova Scotia, de Brahm's survey of the southern district,

1773, with beautiful maps in black and white; Braddock's journal; journal of an officer who traveled in America and the West Indies in 1764-1765;—all of which are of the highest value, many of them having already been printed. In all of the collections there is a large number of maps of great excellence and importance, of which there is an admirable catalogue.

In this rapid and cursory survey it has not been possible to do more than indicate a few of the more striking papers, and to hint at the richness and importance of the entire collection. We next pass to the Privy Council Office, where the documents, of the very highest authority and worth, can be more easily described. First and foremost is the Privy Council Register, of which 99 volumes cover the period from 1613 to 1783; the volumes from 1603 to 1613 and from 1645 to 1649 are missing. These volumes are numbered according to reigns. Marginal headings make the task of searching easy, and there are excellent indexes, most of which were either made or extended by Greville, when clerk of the Privy Council. The importance of the volumes for colonial history begins with 1660, when the first standing committee for foreign plantations was appointed, and continues without diminution until the Revolution. Though the orders of and in council were generally sent to the departmental boards concerned, yet many petitions were acted upon by the committees of the council itself and never passed out of their hands. Consequently there is in the register a large amount of material of the first importance that cannot be found elsewhere. All things considered, this series of volumes is the most valuable single collection of documentary evidence for a study of the policy of Great Britain toward the colonies that we have. It is to be hoped that some day the volumes, for which no suitable place of deposit exists in the present building in Whitehall, will be transferred to the Public Record Office; and that a copy of such portions as relate to American affairs will be brought to this country.

In addition to the register, there are a few important volumes in the Board room of the Council—minutes of the committee for Ireland, a register of admiralty and naval affairs, and thirteen volumes of "Plantation Books". The latter collection, covering the years from 1677 to 1784, contains copies of acts, laws, charters, letters to governors, commissions and instructions of all kinds, orders, surrenders, commissions of review and inquiry, confirmations, letters of marque, warrants of every description, circulars, and occasional grants of land—all relating to the colonies. Such a mass of material of this kind, gathered in one place, whether the documents are to be found elsewhere or not, is a mine of information for colonial

history. In the same room are seven volumes, containing an almost complete set of royal proclamations issued from 1613 to 1819. In the clerk's room is a Precedent Book of considerable interest. On the ground floor, inconveniently housed, are the unbound papers, tied in packets, and dating from 1699, with a few of earlier years. There are from 150 to 160 packets in all, covering the period from 1699 to 1783. The documents, folded and often mutilated, are arranged chronologically, but there is no index or other clue to their contents. Here may be found the original petitions sent to the king in council, with many other papers containing either the additional evidence in the case or the reports of departments or committees. A majority of these reports are duplicates, but again not all, as I found papers here that were neither in the register nor in the departmental records. There are many petitions for grants of land, and a few petitions for patents, memorials from departments, and the like. In studying a particular period it would always be wise, and it would be easier, to examine the register and the unbound papers of a given date before looking into the papers of the departments.

Of the manuscripts relating to America preserved in the Royal Institution little need be said here, for the last volume that has been issued by the Historical Manuscripts Commission, the first of a series, with two or possibly three volumes to follow, contains a full description of the papers and a calendar of about a fourth of them. The documents relate entirely to the period of the Revolution and are contained in 58 bound volumes and 4 cases or rolls—62 in all. Many of these have been printed, and many are duplicates of papers in the Public Record Office and elsewhere. But the collection is still necessary to every student of the Revolutionary period, particularly of the years 1782 and 1783. The earlier letters of Howe, Clinton, and others are to a large extent duplicates, but the later papers, consisting to a considerable extent of accounts, warrants, certificates, muster-rolls, lists, orders, inquisitions, memorials, and petitions, are original. Further information can be obtained from the admirable introduction to the report of the commission.

As an archive-center the Public Record Office surpasses all others in the value and comprehensiveness of its materials. Except for certain well-defined, catalogued, and calendared collections, such as the Colonial Office papers, the scope of the material for American history is not known even to the officials in charge, so that the investigator who would make a systematic search is bound to be in large part a pioneer. Even the preliminary task of mapping out the field is by no means an easy one, as there are comparatively few

guides to the collections in which the material desired is to be found, and the printed or manuscript lists do not always disclose by their descriptions the desired sources.

The following general groups contain practically all the material in the Record Office for colonial history: (1) Admiralty, (2) Audit and Pipe Offices, (3) Abolished Offices, (4) Colonial Office, (5) Courts of Chancery, King's Bench, and Exchequer, (6) Foreign Office, (7) Home Office, (8) Treasury, (9) War Office, and (10) a few miscellaneous collections. The number of volumes listed under these several titles runs into the thousands and presents to the student a discouragingly formidable mass of material. There are printed lists of the Admiralty papers, the Colonial Office papers, the rolls of declared accounts in the Audit and Pipe Offices, the Foreign Office papers, the State Papers, Domestic, and the Home Office papers. There is in preparation an index to the Chancery files. In using these lists three difficulties arise. First, except for the Admiralty, Declared Accounts, and Chancery indexes, there is scarcely one of the printed lists that does not need considerable revision and extension, and the old Colonial Office list has been withdrawn from circulation until a new one shall be prepared. Secondly, inasmuch as the volumes in all the collections contain documents relating to other than American subjects, the descriptions in the lists often do not show whether or not the volumes will be of any use, and unless one is very careful or has the gift of prescience, he will spend a great deal of his time and that of the long-suffering attendant in calling out volumes that contain nothing for his purpose. Thirdly, the collections themselves are undergoing more or less frequent rearrangement and renumbering, so that the references of a decade ago are often of no value to-day. While volume numbers can be depended on, bundle numbers are liable to change. A new system having recently been decided upon, the Admiralty list is almost the only one in a form likely to remain permanent. Because of these conditions the preliminary task of making out a working list of the volumes to be called out is itself long and arduous, and as clue leads to clue, and one set of documents refers across to another, even the carefully wrought preliminary list will undergo modification as the work goes on. There are manuscript lists of those collections for which no printed list has yet been issued, but prepared as they have been for the use of officials, by different persons, who were often unfamiliar with the subject-matter of the volumes, and in many cases much altered to suit the new arrangement, they demand of the searcher time and experience to be used to the best advantage.

The only portions of this material that have been used hitherto

by students of American history are the Colonial Office papers and the documents of correspondence in the Admiralty and War Office records. But even the Colonial Office papers, familiar as they are, embrace hundreds of volumes that have scarcely been examined at all—volumes that are labeled with the name of a West Indian or Canadian colony and so have been deemed outside the scope of the investigation. Yet many of these volumes contain material of the first importance for the history of colonial trade and revenue, and of British policy in general. For example in Bahamas, E (1760–1768) half the volume is taken up with the commercial history of New York and New England, particularly Rhode Island. Even within the continental colonies the listed divisions are often quite arbitrary, as when a volume labeled “South Carolina” is found to be half full of documents relating to Georgia. Furthermore even Public Record officials are human and errors have crept into the lists, both in numbering and description. Volume 29 of the Journal has nothing to do with the Board of Trade; some of the Naval Office lists are in the wrong divisions and are lost to the student; and others conceal their identity under a general title that throws one entirely off the scent. An entry-book of the Council of Trade and Plantations of 1672 is in the division Board of Trade Commercial; a collection of West Florida documents is labeled “West Indies”; and there are other disguises equally noteworthy. Systematic search has certain beneficial results: it not only leads to the discovery of new materials, but it corrects errors in dates and numbering, calls attention to duplicates, identifies missing volumes or scattered members that should be reunited, and, perhaps most important of all, renders possible a more exact definition than now exists of the contents of individual volumes or groups of volumes.

The work of calendaring is going on rapidly, though as yet no attempt has been made to calendar the documents of the Admiralty, War Office, Foreign Office (except for Elizabeth's reign), and Courts of Law. In the case of the last-named, the printed index to the Chancery files, 1649–1714, now in preparation, has almost the value of a calendar; and the manuscript index in the literary search-room to the dockets of Signet bills, the index to the Privy Seal dockets in the Home Office papers, and the index to the patent-rolls (Palmer's index, vol. 38, in literary search-room and index to patent-rolls, vols. 35 and following, in legal search-room) answer somewhat the same purpose. The calendar of the Colonial Office papers has only reached 1697 with its fifteenth volume, the tenth of America and West Indies. The calendar of State Papers, Domestic, which includes Home Office papers to 1760, has been

carried through 1694, except that the period from 1675 to 1689 has not been dealt with. The reigns of Anne and George II are calendared in manuscript, and the omitted portion of William's reign and the reign of George I are to be calendared eventually. After 1760 the Home Office papers are calendared under their own title as far as 1775, which date, twenty years ago, marked the time limit of these documents open to the public. The earliest calendars of the Treasury papers, covering the period from 1557 to 1728, include but one group of Treasury documents—the Original Correspondence or Treasury Board papers,—and take no account of the other papers and books of that department, except an occasional extract from the Minute Book. Under Mr. Shaw's editorship, however, an important change has been made, and the Treasury calendars from 1729 to 1745 include material from all the departmental records, minute-books, warrant-books, letter-books, order-books, etc. Very properly they are called, as they ought to be, calendars of Treasury Books and Papers. No attempt has been made to complete the earlier volumes, so that the full Treasury calendars cover a period of only sixteen years.

All the departmental records are eventually to be arranged in the following order: (1) In Letters, or all letters received by the board, constituting its original correspondence; (2) Out Letters, or copies of all letters written by the department entered in its letter-books or entry-books; (3) Accounts; (4) Registers; (5) Minutes; (6) Miscellanea; and sometimes, as in the case of the Treasury papers, it has become necessary to add a further subheading (7) Miscellanea, Various. This arrangement has been adopted for the first time in the printed Admiralty list, and the change has made havoc with the references of those who consulted the papers before the rearrangement was decided on. At present the scheme is far from complete; and in the transition from the old system to the new, involving the rejection of familiar reference titles, and many transfers, not only within a given group but from one group to another, the manuscript lists present considerable confusion. Where calendaring has been completed and references have been printed, change would seem very undesirable, yet in the State Papers, Domestic, references for the Cromwellian period have been entirely altered, and volumes have been transferred to other collections. It is not likely that the arrangement of the Colonial Office papers will be altered, as the present system is convenient and well understood; but the fact that, for convenience of calendaring, volumes have been broken up and documents redistributed as far as 1708, to which date the calendar has been carried in manuscript, renders uncertain the

policy to be adopted in the future. Against such distribution of documents, of no use to any one except the editor, it is legitimate for the student to raise an earnest protest.

The Admiralty records are open to public inspection as follows: Correspondence, Minutes, Registers, etc., with a few exceptions to the end of the year 1830; Log-Books and Journals to the end of the year 1840; Minute-Books and Pay-Books to the end of the year 1860. This regulation means, therefore, that with the exception of the "Letters relating to the Solicitor's Department" (Admiralty, Secretary's Department, 3665-3728) and "Law Officers' Opinions" (Admiralty, Miscellanea, 298-300), the entire body of Admiralty records during the period of our colonial history is accessible to the student. It is a general regulation that reports by the law-officers of the crown are not open to inspection.

The following résumé will show somewhat the character of the Admiralty documents of value for American history:

Admiralty, Secretary's Department, In Letters, 10 volumes of admirals' despatches, American stations, 1745-1779; letters from the Board of Trade, 2 volumes, 1697-1700, many of which are probably duplicates; original letters from governors of plantations, 4 volumes, 1728-1781, containing documents of great importance relating to admiralty matters of all kinds in the colonies (how many of these letters are duplicates only a careful investigation can show); letters from secretaries of state, 1698-1785, arranged chronologically and containing but little of value; letters from the Treasury, duplicating in many instances the Treasury letter-books, though only frequent testing can determine whether the Treasury preserved copies of all its letters; letters from the Custom House, 5 bundles, 1694-1699, of first importance, because Custom House letters are scarce; orders in council relating to admiralty matters, 36 volumes, 1673-1783, a most useful and convenient collection; letters from the Navy Board, 87 volumes, 1673-1719, full of information about victualing, convoys, and navy questions generally, with some new details about the voyage of the commissioners to Virginia in 1677 and Randolph's work in Massachusetts.

Admiralty, Secretary's Department, Out Letters: about 500 volumes, 1665-1783, containing copies of orders and instructions, secretary's letters, documents relating to colonial appointments, convoys, protection, etc.

Entry Books, 15 volumes, 1689-1783, containing letters relating to admiralty and vice-admiralty courts and business, vice-admiralty commissions, and letters of marque, papers concerning appointments, wrecks, embargoes, convoys, and fees, and a number of

documents relating to Captain Kidd and other pirates, about whom more can be found in Admiralty, Oyer and Terminer, 72 volumes, 1611-1800. These entry-books are an index to almost everything connected with vice-admiralty business in the colonies.

Pass Letter Books, 4 volumes, 1729-1786, contains all documents connected with the issuing of passes, chiefly for trade in the Mediterranean and for protection against Algerine pirates.

Original Patents, Vice Admiralty, furnishes one letters patent authorizing the appointment of a single vice-admiral and proper officers for a single court of vice-admiralty for all America.

Miscellanea contains a register of ships to which passes had been issued and gives both useful information regarding the movements of colonial vessels, and lists of transports licensed to go to America, abstracts of ship's logs, and a tabular statement of exports and imports, 1768-1769, from all colonial ports.

Admiralty, Accountant-General's Account, contains a few documents relating to the purchase of vessels during the American war, with tables of prices, and also many valuable statements of current expenses in America, 1746-1780; also muster-books of transports, a register of hired transports, 1754-1773, lists of ships, 1709-1717; papers and letters respecting loyalists put on board transports, regarding whom there is a very large amount of information in the Treasury papers. These accounts give names of ships, ports of departure, destinations, dates, and cost of victualing.

Admiralty, Navy Board, In Letters, nearly 1,300 volumes, 1673-1789, and Minutes, 170 volumes, 1729-1783, contain minutes of meetings of the board, and a very voluminous correspondence regarding naval stores, transports to America, bounties, victualing, and impressments.

Admiralty, Victualing Accounts, 5 volumes, contains the accounts of agents at yards and stations in North America, 1776-1783.

Log Books, of which there is an alphabetical list in the literary search-room, cannot be used unless the name of the ship is known.

The second great division of the Admiralty papers contains the records of the High Court of Admiralty and is of the greatest importance for certain aspects of colonial history. In the Libels and accompanying papers, Interrogatories, Examinations, etc., are the documents—decrees, libels, interrogatories, examinations, allegations, and sentences of a dozen or more suits connected with the early history of Virginia, Maryland, Plymouth, and Massachusetts Bay. The parchments are much mutilated, and it is not easy to discover in the various series of bundles and volumes all the papers

in the different suits, though to the libels and interrogatories there are manuscript catalogues, unfortunately incomplete.

Assignment Books and Sentences contains four volumes of proceedings before a special court of admiralty, which was instructed to deal with ships or goods taken from or belonging to the colonies after 1776.

Books of Acts, 48 volumes, 1604-1749, contains the records of each sitting of the high court, and furnishes a convenient register of the suits and a chronological history of each suit.

Admiralty, Miscellanea, volume 803, contains letters of marque issued against America in 1812-1814; and numbers 901-1341, an enormous series of 441 bundles, include great masses of papers that came at one time or another into the hands of the Admiralty board. These papers, ranging in date from 1620 to 1775, are without order or arrangement of any kind, and for the present, at least, are practically inaccessible to the student. In this collection Mr. R. G. Marsden discovered the Bradford letter printed in the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* for January, 1903 (VIII, 294-301), and the as yet unpublished letters from Altham and Bridge. After an examination of about forty bundles I can say that the entire collection deserves to be arranged and catalogued.

Proceedings in Vice-Admiralty Courts contains a bundle of papers relating to prize-cases tried in Jamaica, 1747-1748, and another bundle of similar papers relating to Virginia, 1728, South Carolina, 1733-1734, Rhode Island, 1725, Pennsylvania, 1731, and New York, 1724. To this division, though listed elsewhere, belongs a group of papers (Admiralty Court, Prize Papers, bundles, 1821-1825) from the vice-admiralty court at New York, 1777-1783, of considerable interest and value. From their appearance I should judge that these documents had not been opened since they were sent from New York after the evacuation. In the Prize Papers are other documents from the vice-admiralty court at New York, 1739-1786, filed with similar papers from other courts, alphabetically arranged according to names of ships. Letters of Marque, Declarations, Volumes 60-70, 1777-1782, Bonds, 1 bundle, 1777-1780, contain bails, and letters issued against the colonies, 1777-1782; Assignment Books, 3 volumes, contain appeals in prize-cases from vice-admiralty courts in the colonies. The registry and muniment books of the High Court of Admiralty, 1660-1815, are deposited in the admiralty register in the Law Courts and contain a great many papers relating to colonial affairs.

A very fruitful source of information regarding the financial aspects of British colonial administration in the eighteenth century

is the Declared Accounts of the Audit and Pipe Offices. In this collection are more than eighty rolls containing financial statistics of unusual value for the period from 1704 to 1783, all of which are open to public inspection. These rolls contain the accounts of the paymasters-general of the forces, including the allowances to deputy paymasters, inspectors-general, superintendents of hospitals, deputy commissaries, superintendents of forage, quartermasters, commissaries for mustering troops, salaries, garrisons, and current expenses. They include also the expenses of companies in Newfoundland, New England, New York, and elsewhere, the expenses of Oglethorpe and his men from 1738 to 1743, the pay of Braddock and his staff and other expenses of that ill-fated expedition—in short the entire debit account of the British government in North America. The rolls, small at first, become large after 1755, and huge after 1776. In addition to the general charges mentioned above, we have the individual accounts of commissaries, barrackmasters, bridgemasters, contractors and purveyors, postmasters, muster-masters, and quartermasters; the itemized expenses of various expeditions, such as that of St. Leger against Fort Stanwix and that of Campbell against Georgia; an account of the disbursement of the appropriations granted by Parliament to New England, New York, and New Jersey, of the payments of loyalists and refugees, and of the expense of settling them in Nova Scotia. We have an account of customs and duties for 1767 to 1777, “the first general account of these revenues”; of presents to the Indians, 1755 (there are earlier accounts of Indian presents, 1748, in the Treasury papers); of the expenses of certain royal governors—Wentworth, Dinwiddie, Dunmore, and Tryon; of superintendents of Indian affairs; and among the most interesting of all, the account of John Locke as secretary and treasurer of the Council of Trade and Plantations, 1672, and the comptroller-general’s declaration of the general account of the duties arising from the attempted enforcement of the Stamp Act in the colonies, showing the receipts from the sale of stamped paper to distributors, the allowances for stamps and goods returned, and the losses of those who undertook to sell the stamps in America. Finally, there are the accounts submitted by the treasury solicitors, the legal officers of the treasury, of their expenses in the prosecution of various suits in which one or other of the colonies was interested. For example we note the following entry, “for the charges and expenses in the prosecuting a quo warranto against the corporation of Massachusetts Bay in New England and for obtaining judgment and seizing the liberties thereof . . . £181..9..10”.

Of all the departmental records none are more unwieldy than

those of the Treasury. Only the papers that precede the close of the year 1759 are open to public inspection, but permission to examine papers of later date may be obtained. Fees are charged, but the student whose object is strictly literary may be exempted from payment by making a special application.

Treasury, In Letters, or the Treasury Board papers, is probably the most important single collection of documents for American history in the Public Record Office, excepting the Colonial Office papers. An excellent idea of its character and value can be obtained from the calendar, which extends from 1577 to 1745. The volumes and bundles, which to 1783 number about 450 (all numbers after 1763 being bundles), are at present in process of rearrangement and relisting. The bundles are full of valuable material, among which may be noted a great many papers bearing on the history and work of the American Board of Customs Commissioners, 1768-1776, letters, memorials, and petitions of great variety, certificates witnessing the transportation of convicts, a report in 27 folios giving a history of the administration of the custom-house in Boston since 1707 and a lucid account of the trade of the colony, and a host of other papers from one of which we may take the following: "At Philadelphia a series of letters are [*sic*] publishing in the Chronicle, under the name of the Farmer's Letters, denying the right of Parliament to lay any tax whatever on the colonies, and as the author affects moderation and a parade of learning we consider them of the most mischievous tendency." It is not easy to exaggerate the interest and significance of this notable series of documents, which have never been used, so far as I know, for historical purposes. In the same division of In Letters are the Reference Books, 12 volumes, containing chronological entries of applications of one kind or another to the Treasury board, all applications from the colonies being referred to the auditor-general, Blathwayt, Walpole, or Cholmondeley, for an opinion; an Alphabetical Register, 4 volumes, of the petitions, with the comments of the board; a Register, 17 volumes, of papers chronologically arranged; and an Alphabetical-Numerical Register, 3 volumes, or index to every matter in the Treasury papers for the years 1777-1783.

The Treasury, Out Letters, consists of three sets: Letters relating to Customs, 32 volumes, 1667-1783, the later volumes of which are full of information regarding the customs service in the plantations; General Letters, 34 volumes, 1668-1783, of equal interest and value, but of a more general character; Various, a compact and convenient collection, containing two volumes known to the board as "America Books", relating wholly to the colonies and containing copies of all

commissions, warrants, letters patent, writs, privy seals, instructions, etc., of colonial officials (1763-1797), whose appointment was in the hands of the crown.

Of the great series of Treasury, Accounts, the only important groups for our purpose are the Quarterly Accounts in 396 volumes, 1701-1800, containing details of the plantation duty, the expenses of the customs establishments in America and of the officials, as far as they were paid salaries; and the Miscellanea, a collection of important statistical statements, such as, "Gross and Net Produce of all the Branches of the Revenue", and "The Receiver General's Annual Abstracts of Customs and New Impositions" (1746-1780), and other papers touching importation and exportation of iron, rice, sugar, and other commodities. The usefulness of these documents cannot be overestimated.

The Treasury, Registers, Military Establishments, 501 volumes, contains a complete record of these establishments in America by years from 1713 to 1783; though a similar list in the War Office goes back a few years earlier. Emigration, 3 bundles, contains lists, prepared by the custom-house, of all persons who sailed from London or the outports for the plantations from 1773 to 1776; the majority are indentured servants and redemptioners, and their names, ages, trades, and former residences are given, together with the reasons why they left England. Needless to say, these bundles contain material of exceptional interest for the genealogist.

The Treasury, Minute Books, 54 volumes, 1667-1783, supplements the original correspondence and gives the daily proceedings of the board. The volumes are well indexed and easy to use. The miscellaneous papers of the Treasury are divided into two groups: Miscellanea and Miscellanea, Various. The former contains the Order Books, 25 volumes, 1667-1783, with records of warrants for the payment of money in the colonies and statements of the funds against which such payments were to be charged; the Public Disposition Books, 43 volumes, of a character similar to that of the order-books; Warrants relating to Money, or Money Books, 56 volumes, 1676-1783, containing copies of warrants for the payment of customs officials, special commissions, shipmasters for the transportation of convicts, etc.—all of which are addressed to the auditor of the receipt and signed by the Lords of the Treasury; Warrants not relating to Money, 37 volumes, 1679-1786, including warrants for contracts, renewals of office, appointments, etc., having to do with the colonies—a collection of unmistakable value; Warrants, Early, 12 volumes, 1667-1687, having little about the plantations but quite a good deal about British policy; Warrants, Kings, 65

volumes, 1679-1763, containing letters patent, privy seals, royal sign manuals, etc., relating to colonial commissions, salaries, payments for civil establishments, medicines, troops, etc., and letters and instructions for colonial officials and agents. There are also in this collection five bundles dealing with payments to loyalist refugees, and a single bundle dealing with the later history of the loyalist claims and payments to 1820.

More important even than the Miscellanea is the Miscellanea, Various, of which about thirty volumes have to do with colonial affairs. The documents are largely financial in character, but incidentally throw light on other aspects of American history, such as the refugees, supplies for troops, intended expeditions, quit-rents (of North Carolina, a sort of directory of the landed proprietors of that colony in 1735), and other similar matters. There are four volumes of letters to and from commanders-in-chief in America, 1778-1783, and other volumes of accounts and correspondence of deputy paymasters, commissary-generals, and others in Canada and the continental colonies, touching provisions, equipments, warrants, lawsuits, presents to the Indians, appointments, revenue accounts, leaves of absence, and the like. There are naval office lists, shipping returns, lists of plantation bonds, and documents relating to the exchange of prisoners, 1779-1782, from which a complete statement could be compiled of the number and rank of the prisoners in American hands at the close of the war. There are also lists of provincial regiments, registers of commissaries' letters (1779-1782), accounts of moneys paid for secret service, pensions, and bounties (1721-1725), lists of pensions (1779-1782), accounts of imports and exports for 1728, giving a minutely detailed statement of great value for a study of trade relations at that date, an account of all ships belonging to the United States clearing from London, 1783-1784, and other statistical documents of unusual weight and utility for a study of English plantation trade and revenue in the eighteenth century. There are three bundles of papers containing the accounts of the Hessian troops engaged during the war, 1775-1779, with tables giving the exact names, ranks, and numbers of Brandenburg and Anspach forces in America, forming altogether one of the most complete rosters of the Hessians that we have. The documents are in French, German, and English. Finally this collection contains the entry-book of William Blathwayt, auditor-general of the plantations from 1680 to 1718, in three volumes, a work hitherto unknown and of the highest importance, for Blathwayt's reports to the Lords of the Treasury, as well as the deliberation of the Lords as recorded

in the Minute Books, add not a little to our knowledge of the details of colonial history.

Under the control of the Treasury were certain offices, since abolished, and certain commissions of inquiry, since expired, whose books and papers of date later than 1759 are open to inspection only by special permission. Of these offices and commissions three only come within the scope of our examination: the Royal African Company (1673-1821), and the commissions on American Loyalist Claims (1783-1803) and East Florida Claims. The papers of the Royal African Company, first arranged in 1894, date from 1662 to the dissolution of the company. They include a great number of journals, ledgers, invoice-books, cash-books and receipt-books, warrant-books and letter-books, miscellaneous books, some of which contain copies of letters "to the plantations"; five volumes of Barbados and Jamaica ledgers and nine volumes of stock ledgers. For the history of the slave-trade in its relation to the plantations, these volumes admirably supplement the *Calendars*. The papers of the Commission on Loyalist Claims deal with the payments under the fourth article of the treaty of 1783, stipulated to be made to those who had suffered losses in America on account of their loyalty to the British crown. They contain a history of the difficulties that followed between England and the United States until the convention of January, 1803, when a mutual agreement was reached and commissioners were appointed to carry the agreement into effect. Many of the papers are much injured, and in some cases the writing is almost illegible; a final arrangement of the papers has not as yet been made.

The War Office Records covering the entire period of our colonial history are open to public inspection without restriction. Many of the documents, particularly in War Office, In Letters, Original Correspondence (volumes 1-33, 421, 506-533), have already been used for historical purposes, and some have been transcribed and sent to this country. They consist of letters with enclosures from field-officers serving in America, 1778-1783, and from officers of provincial regiments of the same period, with muster-rolls and other military lists. They contain also garrison "states and returns", engineers' letters and papers, general hospital reports, quartermaster-general's statements, Hessian letters with rosters, military and provincial memorials, and letters and papers from the Indian department, ten volumes in all. Following these papers are three volumes of letters and despatches to the secretary or deputy secretary at war, which are indispensable for a study of the campaigns in America. It is impossible here to set forth the variety and extent of this cor-

respondence, which covers the period from 1756 to 1783. Supplemental to this collection is the correspondence of the Secretary of State with the Secretary at War concerning American affairs in the years 1776 to 1781. Worthy of special notice is volume thirty, labeled "West Indies, 1764", which contains documents of very considerable value for the early history of Alabama and Louisiana. Here is a great variety of papers, both original and copies, from Major Farmer of the Thirty-Fourth regiment, regarding the circumstances attending the evacuation of the left bank of the Mississippi, that is, the port of Mobile and the country adjoining, after the peace of 1763. All the documents are interesting and some are very valuable.

The War Office, Out Letters, Secretary of States' Entry Book, or what are sometimes called the War Office common letter-books, from volume 411 to volume 494 (1745-1783), contains apparently every order emanating from the War Office under instruction from the Secretary of State sent to a colonial officer or governor regarding any colonial movement. For the years 1775-1784 there are special "American Letter Books", classed under the heading War Office, Letter Books, Departmental, which deals with promotions, transfers, the disposition of troops, leaves of absence, warrants for courts-martial (also to be found in War Office, Entry Books, volumes 1-19), lists of vacancies, and forms of instructions, from which one infers that the government interfered but little in the management of affairs in America. Matters of rather minor detail are noted in these volumes, and scarcely any of the entries throw light on the general policy of the government. Occasionally, however, we meet with such a statement as this, written by Lord Barrington, the secretary, to General Howe: "it is farthest from my intention to divert the promotions in your army from the proper and regular channel". In a few instances the same letters are entered in both the "Common Letter Book" and the "America Book", and both series ought to be consulted. The "Private Letter Book", 3 volumes, 1751-1782, of War Office, Letter Books, Departmental, is of interest as dealing with advancements in the American staff. The documents are neither numerous nor very important, but occasionally contain statements not found in the formal notifications. War Office, Secretary of State, Marching Orders, 65 volumes, 1688-1783, contains embarkation orders for troops going to America and disembarkation orders for invalids and convalescents returning to England and for troops leaving America. Similar information can be obtained from a bundle, War Office, Embarkation Returns, 1758-1797. The whole matter of commissions in the British army in America can be

worked out by consulting the following series: Notification Books, 31 volumes, 1708-1783; Commission Books, 38 volumes, 1660-1783; and Home Office, Military Entry Books and Warrant Books. Lists of successions can be found in the Succession Books, volumes 1-4, 13-14, arranged both regimentally and chronologically. These volumes contain no entries concerning the officers of the provincial regiments. Information on that subject can be obtained from War Office, Monthly Returns, Foreign Stations, 8 volumes, 1776-1783, where rosters of the provincial and German troops will be found. The student may also be referred to a paper-bound folio volume in Treasury, Miscellanea, Various, bundle 179, and to the War Office, Establishment Books, Military, volume 171, 1783-1789, a bulky volume that should be used in connection with War Office, Annual Army Lists, numbers 164-166, which were made up for the purpose of meeting the claims of families of officers of the several provincial regiments in America raised prior to 1783. The first 46 volumes of War Office, Establishment Books, Military, 1685-1783, are the same as Treasury, Registers, Establishments, Military, except that they contain a few statistics of earlier date (1684-1699).

Of the Home Office papers the public is permitted to inspect only those preceding the end of the year 1779, but the student can obtain a written permit to search the papers after that date. The collection forms a body of documents peculiarly difficult to handle, partly because of the great number of volumes and partly because of the difficulty in determining from the lists what volumes contain matter relating to American history. The situation is somewhat further complicated by the fact that a Home Department was not created until 1785, and that consequently a sharp line cannot be drawn, before that date, between State Papers, Domestic, and Home Office records. The greater part of the Home Office documents prior to the year 1693 (excepting the years 1675-1689) have been calendared under the head of State Papers, Domestic; from 1693 to 1760 there are more than 250 volumes of uncalendared matter; and from 1760 to 1783 102 volumes, of which those as far as 1775 have been calendared under the title Home Office Records, including State Papers, Miscellanea. This latter collection formerly consisted of 500 bundles, most of which have now been dispersed, including the well-known "addresses to the king", printed in Force, *Archives*. Only 97 of these bundles remain to constitute the collection of Miscellanea, and of these very few (seven at most) have anything to do with American affairs. The other documents, those bound in volumes, are rich in Americana. Besides the State Papers, Domestic, there are the State Papers, Domestic, Petitions, first series,

7 volumes, 5 bundles (1708—time of George II); second series, 4 volumes (1760–1781); Petition Entry Books, 28 volumes, (1688–1760), of which the second series of State Papers, Domestic, Petitions, is really the continuation, full of important petitions from the colonies; Warrant Books, 30 volumes, 1609–1633; and Entry Books, 56 volumes, 1681–1779, containing but little of importance.

The Home Office records, listed under that title, consist, first, of letters sent by the secretaries of state to various other departments, such as the admiralty, ordnance, customs, war, and post-office, and to the Privy Council. These letters are accompanied by various enclosures (copies of letters, memorials, and the like), of which the original letters were copied (in full or in abstract) into the entry-books of the office; secondly, letters sent to the secretary of state from the same departments as well as from private individuals, and arranged by the clerks under such headings as Admiralty, Treasury, Ordnance, Circular Books, Ireland, etc. Warrants were entered separately in warrant-books, passes in books of passes, and other documents in their proper entry-books. It often happened that enclosures were not entered at all, and must be searched for in State Papers, Domestic, or among the Colonial Office papers. Of first importance are the papers in Home Office, Admiralty, volumes 166–198, 1775–1783, the greater part of which relate to America and consist of letters from the Lords of the Admiralty to the Secretary of State, with enclosures (both originals and copies) received from the admirals in American stations. Many of these enclosures are duplicates of papers in the Admiralty records. Admiralty Entry Books, 19 volumes, 1693–1784, contains entries of letters sent to the Lords of the Admiralty; Domestic Entry Books, 27 volumes, 1706–1785, contains a few American documents before 1772 but nothing after that date; Ordnance, 8 volumes, 1732–1784, contains useful letters from the Ordnance Office relating to the colonies, though after 1765 the number is small; Ordnance and War Office, 2 volumes, 1776–1782, includes chiefly entries of letters from Lord George Germain to the ordnance and war departments relating wholly to American affairs and therefore of considerable value.

Among the most useful of the Home Office records are the documents labeled Post Office, Treasury and Customs, and Custom House, Miscellanea. The first, in 9 bundles, 1704–1780, deals with the inauguration of the system of packet-boats to America and the West Indies, and throws much light on the mail facilities during the period 1756 to 1780, a matter of no little importance; the second, in 21 volumes, 1729–1783, contains papers of the utmost value for the period after 1775, showing the sources of much of Lord George

Germain's information and outlining his policy. It includes also original letters from the Custom House, with copies of enclosures, the originals of which have probably been destroyed; and extracts from ship-captains' letters, the contents of some of which are amusing, as the following extract will show. Under date of December 14, 1775, one captain writes, "This day a person came to this place who left Philadelphia the 3d of last month; he says that the Congress are quarrelling and in great confusion; that they have voted to establish the Presbyterian religion all over America; that this is carried by the New Englanders very much against the minds of the southern delegates as well as the Quakers". Custom House, Miscellanea, 1 volume, 1768-1775, is an entry-book of letters sent by the "register general of shipping over the ports under the management of the Honorable Board of Commissioners from No. America" to the collectors and comptrollers of customs at the different ports in the colonies from Halifax to Savannah. This is a valuable volume, supplemental to the Treasury Board papers, for any one wishing to study the career of the American Board of Customs Commissioners.

The Foreign Office records, which are open to public inspection to the end of the year 1780, after which date a written permit is required, need not detain us long. There is but one volume, covering the period before 1783, containing diplomatic papers relating to the United States. These include letters and papers from the American ministers, Franklin, Adams, and Jay, at Paris. They concern the preliminary articles of the treaty, the opening of ports, the extension of trade, various propositions for a definitive treaty, and the like. It would be necessary, however, for the student investigating the diplomacy of the period to search the French, Dutch, German (Hanoverian, Brunswicker, and Hessian), Prussian, Russian, Spanish, Portuguese, and Swedish papers, where will be found documents of great importance in the communications of the various British ministers to the home government. A new classification of some of the Foreign Office papers is in progress.

In closing, attention may be called to three classes of papers belonging to our subject that cannot be dealt with here at length. In the Public Record Office are many groups of important documents, already more or less known to scholars: the Manchester papers, calendared in one of the reports of the Historical Manuscripts Commission; the Shaftesbury papers, in part unpublished, but listed in the thirty-third Report of the deputy keeper; the Pitt despatches, soon to be edited and printed under the auspices of the Society of Colonial Dames; and the Cornwallis manuscripts, a number of which have been printed in the *Cornwallis-Clinton Correspondence*, edited

by B. F. Stevens. Secondly, in the various docket-books, in the collections of king's bills, signet bills, privy seals, king's sign manuals, and patent-rolls, and in the accounts of the Clerk of the Hanaper, there is ample information for any one desiring to trace the passage of a colonial charter through the seals; and in the records of the Chancery Court and the Court of King's Bench may be found the proceedings and fees connected with the vacation of colonial charters. Lastly, there is the great mass of Colonial Office papers, calendared to 1697 and contained in nearly 2,000 well-arranged volumes or bundles, an analysis of which is in itself a sufficient subject for a separate paper and can well be left for another time. Within a few years there have been discovered more than 600 volumes, classified under the title of Modern Trade papers and now known as Board of Trade, Commercial, two series, that must have been originally a part of the Board of Trade papers. I shall not attempt to describe these papers now. After a careful examination of the entire collection, I am convinced that, as compared with the other Board of Trade papers, these volumes and bundles contain but little of importance for colonial history. Single volumes are occasionally of value, but as a whole the collection is disappointing.

I have now passed in review some of the most important of the materials in British archives for American colonial history. Enough remains, however, undescribed to constitute a mass of material larger even than that which we have here presented. The Colonial Office papers, the ecclesiastical records, and the documents in private hands make up a formidable body of evidence, better known, however, than that contained in the departmental volumes. In time all this material will be made available for historical students, and while the extent of it is often discouraging and the content frequently disappointing, nevertheless it is a distinct gain if we know what there is and what it contains. Imperfect as I know my examination of these documents to have been, I find encouragement in the thought that even an imperfect examination, if it be neither inaccurate nor misleading, is better than no examination at all, and that better men will build on what their predecessors have tried to accomplish.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

DOCUMENTS

Some Papers of Franklin Pierce, 1852-1862.

(*Second Installment.*)

XIII. HON. JOHN W. GEARY TO PRESIDENT PIERCE.

Private.

LECOMPTON, KANSAS TERRITORY,

January 12th 1857.

His Excellency, Franklin Pierce.

My dear Sir :

Your friendly letter of the 12th ult., by the hands of Col: Winston¹ has been received.

I thank you, not only for your many personal assurances of confidence, but also for your public and decided approval of my official action.

Next to my personal honor and the approbation of my conscience, I value the success of your administration and hold sacred the delicate trust confided to me.

"Be so just and true to the right that no man can challenge your impartiality", is an instruction so eminently just that it meets a warm response in my heart and will be my steady rule of action.

In the discharge of my executive duties, I have known and will continue to know "no party, no section, nothing but Kansas and my country", and any measured success I have attained here is due to my determination to administer "equal and exact justice".

Fully conscious of all the difficulties surrounding my delicate and responsible mission and with the general prediction of failure, I entered upon it calmly and deliberately with no fear of failure so long as I was conscious of your cordial and energetic support.

This feeling was necessary for my success, and my usefulness will be destroyed the moment this consciousness ceases.

The removal of Judge Lecompte became a necessity and "public policy" will certainly justify it in the eyes of all right thinking men. His peculiar entanglement in Kansas affairs and his partizan feeling evinced on repeated occasions, destroyed his public usefulness and was a great obstacle in the way of the recognition of the authority of the courts. The collision between the Judge and myself must be judged in the light of its *Kansas surroundings*.²

I deemed the act necessary (and upon the maturest reflection have no reason to change the opinion then formed,) to prevent the rescue of the Free-State prisoners and to preserve the peace of the territory.

¹ Isaac Winston, United States marshal for Kansas Territory.

² See "A Defense by Samuel D. Lecompte", in *Kansas Historical Collections*, 1903-1904 (VIII, 389 ff.). See also *ibid.*, VII, 375, note.

It will not do to apply the same rules to the government of an old, well regulated state and to a Territory just emerging from an insurrection, like a sleeping volcano ready to burst forth at any moment. An act done in the one may be harmless, while in the other it would produce an explosion.

All eyes were upon me, and the moment I evinced the slightest complicity with either party, that moment the equilibrium was destroyed and the peace endangered.

No arrests were supposed to be made without my agency, and all discharges were attributed to me, as I had really resurrected the civil authority.

The discharge of Hayes,¹ after his arrest, through my agency, at once placed me in a false position, and public confidence would have been annihilated in the impartiality of my administration had I not immediately repudiated all connection with the imprudent action of the Judge.

There is a matter in this case which should have some weight in the question. The evidence before the Grand Jury was pointed to the fact that Hayes was the very man who committed the horrid act for which a pro-slavery Grand Jury found a true bill against him for murder in the first degree; and of this I was advised when I ordered the arrest.

The right to destroy property to prevent the spread of a conflagration has been traced to the highest necessity and the natural rights of man independent of society or civil government. It is referred by moralists and jurists to the same great principle which justifies the exclusive appropriation of a plank in a shipwreck, though the life of another be sacrificed; with the throwing overboard goods in a tempest for the safety of the vessel; with the trespass upon the lands of another to escape death by an enemy.

The common law adopts the principles of the natural law, and places the justification of an act otherwise tortious precisely upon the same ground of necessity.

Actual or strong apparent necessity must exist as the sole ground of justification and the conduct of the individual must be regulated by his own judgment as to the exigencies of the case.

Being the centre of almost hourly communication with every part of the territory, and occupying an independent and impartial position, I had access to sources of information entirely closed to others. My judgment imperatively demanded the course of action I adopted, and I would have been recreant to duty and self-convicted of all consequences, had I evinced hesitation.

¹ Charles Hays, a member of the band of Kickapoo Rangers, found guilty by a grand jury of the murder of David C. Buffum near Leecompton, and discharged on bail by Chief Justice Leecompte. See John H. Gihon, *Geary and Kansas* (Philadelphia, 1866), 166-181, for a full though partizan account of this affair, showing the part taken by Pierce and Geary. See also Charles Robinson, *The Kansas Conflict* (New York, 1892), 339 and "A Defense by Samuel D. Leecompte", cited above.

The beneficial result of new and impartial officers will soon be apparent to the country in the general recognition of law and respect for the civil authority.

I desire especially that all officers coming here should be impressed with the necessity of attending to their legitimate duties, entirely avoiding partizan affiliations, as the best means of securing the respect of the people.

Judge Cunningham¹ and Mr. Winston² (neither of whom I had previously known,) seem to be "intelligent, thoroughly conservative and right minded men". The benefit of their presence is already apparent. I have heard favorable accounts of Messrs. Harrison³ and Spencer.⁴ I wish you would send them here as soon as possible.

As I have always endeavored with all the Territorial officers, so will I continue, to "cultivate kind relations with Judge Cato",⁵ although I regret that his associates have been anything but satisfactory. I am, however, happy to be able to say that I have less objection to him than to any of the old officers.

Last Tuesday was the day fixed by the Topeka State Constitution for the meeting of the so-called Free-State Legislature.

In my last dispatch to the State Department I mentioned the precautionary measures which I had quietly taken in the matter.

I had also confidential agents at Topeka and other places and had every assurance that no quorum would be present and that no business would be transacted in the slightest manner conflicting with the territorial government. Dr. Charles Robinson gave me assurances that he would resign his Governorship, which he accordingly did, and he was on his way to Boston upon the day of the meeting. W. Y. Roberts⁶ the Lt. Governor, I was informed would not attend, and Mr. Klotz,⁷

¹ Thomas Cunningham, of Beaver County, Pennsylvania, appointed by Pierce November 19, 1856, to fill the vacancy occasioned by the death of Associate Justice J. M. Burrell. He was an active Democrat and one of the electors for Buchanan. After looking the ground over carefully, he resigned. Joseph Williams, of Iowa, was appointed as his successor, June 3, 1857.

² See note 1, page 350.

³ C. O. Harrison, of Kentucky, nominated by Pierce November 17, 1856, to supersede Lecompte as chief justice, but not confirmed by the Senate, February 17, 1857. See *Kansas Historical Collections*, VII, 332, note.

⁴ William Spencer, appointed by Pierce in 1856 as United States marshal of Kansas Territory to succeed Israel B. Donalson. *Ibid.*, IV, 657.

⁵ Sterling G. Cato, of Alabama, associate justice of the United States court for the territory of Kansas. See *ibid.*, IV, 555 ff., VIII, 390, note.

⁶ Colonel William Y. Roberts, of Pennsylvania.

⁷ Robert Klotz, of Pennsylvania, who reached Pawnee in December, 1854, and opened a hotel there, which, according to a local chronicler, usually had a more ample stock of "fluids" than of "solids". He superintended the construction of the building erected for the use of the legislature. For some reason the early Kansas lawmakers boycotted his hotel. Klotz was a member of the Topeka Constitutional Convention of 1855. He later returned to Pennsylvania and was elected a member of the Forty-seventh Congress. Philip C. Schuyler was secretary of state under the Topeka Constitution, and continued in this office until the dissolution of the Free-State organization. See *Kansas Historical Collections*, VII, 372.

the Secretary of State, was in Pennsylvania. So you will perceive that I had but little occasion for apprehension.

To provide against all contingencies I had a reliable agent at Topeka, to give me early notice of all movements, determining to repair there in person in case my presence became necessary.

Certain officious gentlemen in this place, under the impression and with the wish that the Free-State men would resist as heretofore, and thus furnish a pretext for renewed excitement, and in pursuance of a scheme they had been nursing for a long time, through their agent Saml. J. Jones, Ex. Shff: of this County,¹ made an information before Judge Cato against some thirty-four members of the old Topeka Legislature for usurpation of office on the 4th of March, 1856. Judge Cato issued a warrant to Marshal Donaldson, whose Deputy, Pardee, proceeded *alone* to Topeka, arrested twelve persons without the slightest resistance and brought them to Tecumseh, where, waiving all examination, they were held to bail in their own recognizance in the sum of Five Hundred Dollars each..

The intelligent action of these Free-State men in promptly submitting to the process of the Court entirely defeated this nefarious conspiracy to disturb the peace of the Territory, placed its actors in a ridiculous light and has excited a respect and sympathy for men heretofore regarded as fanatics. The Free-State men now understand their true policy to be in favor of peace, as even the color of disturbance here would prevent the immense spring emigration and they are fully resolved to furnish no pretext for disturbance.

The object of the meeting at Topeka, as I am reliably informed, was to petition Congress for the repeal of the Kansas Statutes and the reorganization of the Territory upon the Organic act with such additional checks as the wisdom of Congress might suggest, and not to enact *laws*.

Judge Cato in the strongest terms condemned it to me, but remarked in his own justification that "the information being made before him in due form by a responsible man, it was his *duty* to issue the warrant".

If this Topeka movement had not been noticed, it would have died a natural death, as they failed to secure a quorum, and this imprudent interference has furnished a plausible excuse for what would otherwise have been a gross failure. They will not lose so good an opportunity to write glowing letters, redolent with Kansas outrages and the violation of Constitutional rights.

No real injury however to the interests of peace will result from this ridiculous *faux pas*.

As I have informed you in former letters, there has almost from the first, been a combination here (the leaders of which are Genl. Calhoun, Sheriff Jones, with other lesser men at various points of this Territory, and having their headquarters in Westport) to defeat my policy and to create the impression that the existing peace is entirely illusive and with-

¹ Douglas County. See *ibid.*, 333, note.

out solid foundations. Various expedients have been devised to precipitate a collision between myself and the Pro-Slavery party and with this view the most lying rumors had been put in circulation and the boldest predictions of war proclaimed.

The Convention that was to meet in Leavenworth, assembled here this evening, and before receiving the credentials of its members, a discussion ensued whether the body was to be termed "law and order" or Pro-Slavery, and an amendment was carried that no person should be entitled to a seat in the Convention *unless he was in favor of making Kansas a Slave State*. Genl. Clark,¹ Sheriff Jones, J. H. Stringfellow² and Jones³ of the Lecompton Union were the principal speakers. The resolution was carried by few voices and met with no enthusiasm.

The Legislature organized to-day and I expect to transmit my message as soon as I have proper notice of the organization.

I will exhaust all the resources of circumspection and prudence in my official communications with parties in this Territory. I apprehend no difficulty. I am fully resolved that the spirit and intention of the Organic act shall be fairly carried out, and if needs be, I will use a vigor of action sufficient to awe conspirators and preserve the peace.

With sentiments of the highest respect, I remain,

Your friend

JNO. W. GEARY.

XIV. PIERCE'S CABINET TO FRANKLIN PIERCE (COPY).

WASHINGTON 3 March, 1857.

Sir :

We are not willing to allow our common relation as members of your Cabinet to cease without communicating the sentiments which the retrospect of intimate and long continued official association has left indelibly impressed on our minds.

We have witnessed with satisfaction and respect the untiring devotion to the public service, — the most ardent zeal for the good of the country, — the purity of purpose, — and the scrupulous observance of constitutional principles which has been manifested by you at all times and in all circumstances. As the territory, population, wealth and power of the Union continue to increase, so, in the same proportion do the cares and responsibility of the administration of its government. Each successive presidential period brings with it new events of national importance and

¹George W. Clark, United States government agent for the Pottawatomie Indians. See letter of Geary, December 22, 1856, in the REVIEW, October, 1904, 124-127. *Kansas Historical Collections*, VI, 63-64.

²Captain John H. Stringfellow, of Virginia, a brother of Dr. B. F. Stringfellow, and co-editor of the *Squatter Sovereign*, which was established February 3, 1855, by J. H. Stringfellow and Robert S. Kelley, at Atchison. They sold it in 1857 to an association of which Ex-Senator S. C. Pomeroy was agent, and it became a Free-State paper. See *Kansas Historical Collections*, VII, 331-332, note.

³A. W. Jones and C. A. Faris established the *Lecompton Union*, May 3, 1856, as a pro-slavery paper.

consequent collision of interest or convictions. Ours are institutions of free thought and speech. Every citizen participates in the conduct of public affairs, and in the scrutiny and the judgment of public men. He, therefore, who is highest in place and in functions, is, of necessity, peculiarly subject amid the prejudices and the passions of the hour to encounter blames when a better understanding of his motives and of his acts would ensure commendation. We who have seen you most and with the fullest opportunities of appreciation, know well how conscientiously you have discharged the high trust devolved upon you, and we confidently believe that, as time rolls on, the voice of impartial history will ratify our attestation of the integrity and patriotism of your exercise of the executive power of the United States.

We desire also to express our grateful sense of the dignified courtesy and considerate candor which has uniformly marked your deportment towards us, both in the consultations of the Cabinet and in the business of our respective Departments. This, while it has served to lighten our official labor, and facilitate its performance, has efficiently contributed to maintain a unity of administration, few examples of which occur in the annals of the Republic.

With earnest regard and warm wishes for your health and happiness,

We have the honor to be,
Your sincere friends,

W. L. MARCY
JAMES GUTHRIE
JEFFERSON DAVIS
J. C. DOBBIN
R. McCLELLAND
JAMES CAMPBELL
C. CUSHING.

Franklin Pierce,
President of the United States.

XV. FRANKLIN PIERCE TO MEMBERS OF HIS CABINET (COPY).

WASHINGTON March 4, 1857.

Gentlemen:

Your uninterrupted manifestation of personal friendship for me, during the past four years leaves no occasion for reassurance of your cordial regard now that we are about to separate.

I participate fully in the gratification which you express in reference to our daily intercourse happily undisturbed by any element of discord and I shall ever hold in grateful appreciation the extent to which my most severe and perplexing official labors have been lightened by your unfailing and cheerful cooperation.

It will, I am sure, be an agreeable recollection to us all, that whatever else the Administration may have done or omitted to do, it has not sought applause by the adoption of temporising expedients, nor immunity from censure by the negative character of its policy and measures.

The violent assaults which it has encountered on the one hand, and the zeal with which it has been defended on the other, are conclusive upon the point that it has been one of positive good, or positive evil.

The exercise of the veto power on sundry occasions, involving, in some instances, large individual pecuniary interests, and in others questions of public policy, of an exciting character; the discussion in annual and special messages of controverted constitutional principles and of the rights of the States under our system, have undeniably been a fruitful source of complaint and vituperation. These were matters which alone could be determined by my own conscience and judgment and in the responsibility of which no one could participate.

You may I think recur to the condition of the country during the four years now about to close. It has concededly been a period of general prosperity; defalcation on the part of federal officers has been almost entirely unknown; the public treasury, with more than \$20,000,000 constantly on hand, has been free from the touch of fraud or peculation; long pending foreign questions have been amicably and advantageously adjusted; valuable additions have been made to our already vast domain; and peace has been maintained with all the nations of the earth and without compromise of right or a stain upon the national honor.

Whatever of credit pertains to the Federal Executive in the accomplishment of these results, is attributable in great measure, to the fidelity, laborious habits and ability of the heads of the different Departments.

In my final retirement from active participation in public affairs I shall observe the career which awaits you individually, with the interest of constant and unabated friendship.

Your friend,

FRANKLIN PIERCE.

Hon. Wm. L. Marcy

“ James Guthrie

“ Jefferson Davis

“ Jas C. Dobbin

“ Robt McClelland

“ James Campbell

“ Caleb Cushing.

XVI. GENERAL G. T. BEAUREGARD TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

NEW ORLEANS, March 5th, 1857

My dear General:

Permit a sincere friend upon your retirement from the Presidential chair to congratulate you on the prosperous and favorable condition in which you leave the country and the Government to your successor, notwithstanding all the troubles and obstacles arising from the excitement of the worst passions of the worst parts of our population you had to contend with.

Let your opponents, enemies and false friends croak as they will. History will give you ample credit for the ability firmness and fearless-

ness you have displayed in the execution of your always responsible, and at times very trying, duties. We of the South are or should be, everlastingly grateful to you for the manly and independent course you adopted when our sacred rights were about being trampled upon by an unscrupulous and insolent majority in the lower House of Congress.

Shall we not have ere long the honor of a visit from you and your estimable Lady? We would be proud and happy to be able to extend to you both the Hospitalities of our good city.

That you may find in your retirement all the comforts and enjoyments you are both so deservedly entitled to, is the hope and prayer of, my dear General,

Your most sincere friend and serv't,

G. T. BEAUREGARD.

General Franklin Pierce,
Ex-president of the U. States,
Washington, D. C.

XVII. JEFFERSON DAVIS TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

BRIERSFIELD MI. July 23, 1857.

My dear friend.

I had intended to have written to you some time since, but when I returned from Jackson where our state convention met in the latter part of June, I found my little boy quite sick and, as soon as he was able to travel, hurried off to the sea-coast of Missi. where I left my wife and the children for the summer. Little Jeff was well and Maggie and Mrs. Davis in better health than when they left home.

During the session of the Convention a resolution was introduced censuring Gov. R. J. Walker.¹ An amendment was offered to include Presidt. Buchanan, and a member² proposed to extend the censure to you; on the ground that he had learned from the U. S. Dist. Atty., Isaacs,³ that you had made appointments for Kansas with the design of aiding the free-soilers and had sent out agents charged with your views to oppose the introduction of slavery into that territory. I replied, when subsequently called on to address the Convention. First stating what had been reported to me, for I was not present when the remarks were made and asking if I had been correctly informed. Upon being answered in the affirmative I proceeded in terms less polite than just to pronounce the statement untrue. An animated conversation ensued and the position was changed to the statement that Mr. Isaacs had told him (Mr. Archer) that certain persons who had come to Kansas stated your wish to be that Kansas should be a free State. After ridiculing a charge based upon the report of unknown persons of a conversation held with another at a remote time and place, I said that of your personal prefer-

¹ Robert James Walker, of Mississippi, appointed by Buchanan March 10, 1857, as governor of Kansas, to succeed Geary.

² Archer.

³ See No. XII., Geary to Pierce, December 22, 1856 AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, X, 124-127, October, 1904.

ences it was not for me to speak, nor in the present connection for them to inquire but that he who charged you with using your executive functions to aid the free-soilers in Kansas uttered a slanderous falsehood, which years of friendship and an intimate knowledge of your opinions authorized me to denounce.

I said that Northern Democrats generally feared the political effect of a pro-slavery constitution in Kansas, that Southern Democrats had not claimed that Northern Democrats should concur in their abstract opinions in relation to African slavery, that he who recognized the rights we have under the Constitution had done all which was essential, and when as in your case his cordial support of those rights had brought upon him the combined batteries of all our enemies that he was entitled to the support of southern men, and instead of carping criticisms, to unstinted commendation and unqualified approval. Mr. Archer is an extreme man, of high personal respectability and great tenacity of purpose. He announced toward the close of the altercation that he would write to Mr. Isaacs, and said he had been an ardent friend and supporter of yours until he felt you were not sincere, and that the report of certain persons had been strengthened by the character of the governors sent to Kansas by you.

The Convention was so entirely on my side that Mr. A. had little attention and no support, and but for the threat to sustain his allegations by writing to Mr. Isaacs and the possibility that the public would hear of the matter again, I would not have disturbed you with this recital. The attempt to make a distinction between you and myself was rejected and with happy effect. I think the motive was friendship for Walker, not hostility to you, and beyond the irritation of the occasion will not be visited upon me. I add the last lest some report of a [word illegible] correspondent should lead you to think otherwise.

Mrs. Davis and myself speculate on the chances of meeting Mrs. Pierce and yourself again. We were much gratified to hear of her improved health and trust a southern winter will confirm it. Your many friends in this region expect a visit from you.

I thank you for your speech in Faneuil Hall, it was quoted by me in my speech at Jackson. Your mode of saving the Union is substantially the same as that proposed by Calhoun in his last speech in the Senate, a concurrence which was hailed by the State's Rights Democracy, which means all from whom you could accept anything in this community.

With love to Mrs. Pierce, I am as ever

Your friend,

JEFFN. DAVIS.

Presdt. Franklin Pierce.

XVIII. CHIEF JUSTICE R. B. TANEY TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

FOUQUIER WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, Aug. 29, 1857.

My Dear Sir :

You will see by the date of this letter that I am again at the place where I had the pleasure of meeting you last summer, and I have met

here again our old friend Mr. Taylor. We talk about you and Mrs. Pierce when we meet, and when the mails come I look to see if the newspapers say anything as to your whereabouts or of the health of Mrs. Pierce and yourself. The last accounts represented you as in good health and Mrs. Pierce as improving. I hope the report is true as to both.

You see I am passing through another conflict, much like the one which followed the removal of the deposits, and the war is being waged upon me in the same spirit and by many of the same men who distinguished themselves on that occasion by the unscrupulous means to which they resorted.

At my time of life when my end must be near, I should have enjoyed to find that the irritating strifes of this world were over, and that I was about to depart in peace with all men and all men in peace with me. Yet perhaps it is best as it is. The mind is less apt to feel the torpor of age when it is thus forced into action by public duties. And I have an abiding confidence that this act of my judicial life¹ will stand the test of time and the sober judgment of the country, as well as the political act of which I have spoken.

Your successor has I think, a difficult time before him. Symptoms of discord are already appearing. Feeling as I do the necessity of cordial union among the friends of the administration in order to prevent the government from falling to pieces, I am unwilling to find fault with the present administration even when I cannot approve. Yet I must say to you that I deeply regret the adoption of the principle of rotation in office.

Its inevitable consequence will be to multiply the number of political adventurers and trading politicians who are always ready to sacrifice the public interests for their own individual profit, and our elections instead of being contests for principles will in a short time become contests for the emoluments of office, and influenced by mere mercenary motives. The removal of persons who are opposed to the Administration by seeking to displace it, stands on a very different principle. Indeed I never could comprehend how a man of right principles and right feeling could consent to hold an office under persons whom he thought it his duty to oppose and was endeavoring to turn out. But the principle adopted by the present administration is a very different one; is now, for the first time, brought into the Government and will, I fear, do great mischief.

I shall return to Washington about the 15th or 20th of September, and hope that at some leisure moment you will let me hear from you. And with my best regards to Mrs. Pierce, I am, dear sir, most respectfully and truly,

Your friend and servt.,

R. B. TANEY.

General Franklin Pierce,
Concord, New Hampshire.

P. S. Mr. Taylor, having understood that I was about writing you, requests me to send his best regards.

¹The Dred Scott decision.

XIX. JEFFERSON DAVIS TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON, D. C. Jan. 17, 1859.

My dear friend,

Your letter relieved [me] of an anxiety created by the absence of any recent intelligence concerning you. We are dragging on here in a manner significant of no good to the country. Each day renders me more hopeless of effecting anything for the present or prospective benefit of the country by legislation of Congress. Even more than heretofore Members and Senators represent extreme opinions and may increase, but cannot allay, the ferment which gave to them political life. I am gratified by the view you take of my New England tour. The abolitionists and the disunionists combined to assail me for the speeches made there. I hope the Southern assailants have been scotched and the others may rail on to their content. That tour convinced me that the field of useful labor is now among the people and that temperate, true men could effect much by giving to the opposite section the views held by the other. The difference is less than I had supposed.

Your old friends in Missi have not forgotten you and are ready to show their appreciation of you on the first occasion. Many said to me that your renomination for the Presidency was their first wish and best hope.

Mrs. Davis was quite happy in our sojourn in Maine and at Boston but often wished it could have been possible to have found Mrs. Pierce at home. Our children have grown rapidly and the little girl is now quite a companion to me when at evening I go home to forget the past and postpone the future.

Clay¹ and Fitzpatrick² were happy to find you still remembered them and both said they would write to you. I will send you some papers which I hope may be more fortunate in their journey than were those of last year.

Please give my kindest regards to Mrs. Pierce of whom we speak often and to whose return we look with affectionate solicitude. You may scold me roundly as I deserve for not writing to you more regularly, but do not I pray you fail to give me credit for good resolves and do let me hear from you as often as your convenience will allow.

As ever your friend,

JEFF^r. DAVIS.

XX. JEFFERSON DAVIS TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

OAKLAND, Allegheny Co., Md, Sept. 2, 1859.

My dear friend,

I am rejoiced to know that you are again at home and to learn from your remarks at Boston that Mrs. Pierce is in better health.

Your letter from England³ was not received until after the date on which you directed me to write to you at London. I consequently

¹ Clement Claiborne Clay, elected United States senator from Alabama, 1853, re-elected in 1859, withdrew 1861. *Appletons' Cyclopaedia of American Biography*.

² Benjamin Fitzpatrick, United States senator from Georgia. *Ibid*.

³ Where he had gone for the benefit of Mrs. Pierce's health in the spring of 1858.

waited to hear further of your movements. We are here because of Mrs. Davis' feeble health. She has not been well since last winter and this place was selected because of mountain retreats it was the most accessible. I returned from Missi. near to the last of July and have been seriously ill, though now free of disease my strength has not been restored and there is constant apprehension of a relapse. Please give our love to Mrs. Pierce and assure her of our constant solicitude and desire to see her. Maggie says she remembers you both and always loves you. Jeff is nearly as large as Maggie and very stout. The infant (Joe) is more like Maggie than Jeff. I hope we shall have the satisfaction of submitting them all to your inspection at some future day and I will [not] trouble you now with a description impartial though it would naturally be. Will you make your once contemplated visit to the South this winter?

In reference to your views of your political position I will say that I do not think you are called upon to make any disclaimer in relation to the Charleston Convention. You would not under any circumstances seek the nomination and I hope you will not obstruct the wish of your friends, should circumstances indicate it, to use your name for the nomination.¹

In Missi. I am sure you are preferred above all others. The reason is two-fold: first it is personal, which includes attachment and confidence, second it arises from the fact that the opposition to your administration was of a kind which would make the issue between the Abolitionists and the friends of the Constitution as distinct as the most ultra pro-slavery man could render it, without the draw-back which may be felt on account of the fiction just now prevalent that the South desires to reopen the African slave trade and to enact a slave code by Congress to be enforced in the Territories, by federal power.

The decency and good sense of the people must revolt against the low chicanery by which the Presidency is sought by certain ambitious demagogues and the reaction will be favorable to a gentleman whose self-respect and respect for the people have led him to withdraw from public notice rather than obtrude himself upon the popular attention as a candidate for the Presidency, an office which you will doubtless agree

¹ There are among the Pierce papers several letters from prominent politicians of the period in which inquiry is made as to the availability of Pierce as a candidate before the Charleston Convention of 1860. Some writers merely express the hope that Pierce will accept a renomination. Others warmly urge him to that course upon the ground that he is the only man who can unite the Northern and Southern wings of the party and save the Union.

On September 22, 1859, in a letter written from Andover, Mass., to Eli S. Shorter of Eufala, Alabama, Pierce said: "I feel . . . that my public life is closed and have not a single lingering desire that it should be otherwise. This and more my friends at the North fully understand. They know that it would annoy me if I believed that my name could come before the Charleston Convention under any possible combination of circumstances. Although some of my warm personal friends have been elected delegates in Maine and Massachusetts and more probably will be in New England, I have reason to believe that they will regard my wishes in this relation."

with me, can never be properly filled by one who has sought it in the mode and by the means known as electioneering.

Until we meet I will hope to hear from you often. Not knowing where to send this if you shall have left Boston I will request that it be fordd. to you. With best wishes I am as ever very truly yr friend

JEFF^N. DAVIS.

Excy. F. Pierce

XXI. FRANKLIN PIERCE TO H. D. PIERCE.¹

CLARENDON HOTEL CITY OF NEW YORK Dec^r 21, 1859

My dear Brother—

I hope you will feel a sufficient interest in us to desire to know how we have progressed thus far on our journey.

After three or four weeks with our friends (the Masons) in Boston very agreeably, we made pleasant visits of a week at Hartford and a week at New Haven.

On Wednesday last we came to this City where we will remain till this day week, (Saturday Jan^y 7th) when we propose to embark for Nassau in the Island of New Providence, one of the Bahama group. The climate is represented to be very fine and we shall in the absence of bad weather or bad luck reach the Island in four days. Frank had better find it on the map and thus get a distinct idea of our geographical location. I am sorry to say that in my intercourse with residents of this city or with people casually here I have found nothing to quiet my apprehensions with regard to the serious dangers which threaten the Union. Orders for merchandize and for various articles of manufacture are being constantly countermanded by the Southern people, social intercourse between the North and the South and business arrangements also are being seriously disturbed—and if the interruption becomes much more complete, political relations cannot long be maintained. What the effect even of this interruption must be upon New England which depends to so great an extent upon the intelligent application of ingenuity and industry to the mechanic arts no well informed man can fail to foresee and no man whether well informed or not will fail to feel. Disasterous as disruption would be to all portions of the Country the blow will fall most heavily upon New England so far as property and prosperity are concerned. Prosperity! there would be none, and property not enough to talk about. But after all the prostration of material interests would constitute but one of the most inconsiderable elements in the general disaster. Under existing circumstances I deplore the necessity, which calls me away from home. The Union meetings² are well so far as they go and for the present. But

¹ His brother, of Hillsboro, New Hampshire.

² The *Boston Daily Courier* for Friday, December 9, 1859, in giving an account of the Union meeting in Faneuil Hall on the preceding evening, prints a long and interesting letter of Pierce to the Executive Committee of Boston Citizens, dated Concord, December 7, 1859, giving his opinion of the John Brown raid and of Abolition sentiment concerning the raid. Soon afterward Clark, Fellows, and Company, of Boston, reprinted the *Courier* of December 9 as a pamphlet, with an edition of 5,000 copies. A copy of this letter in Pierce's handwriting is among the Pierce papers.

if we cannot wrest political power from the hands of fanatical sectionalism, the speeches which have been made, the letters which have been written and the resolutions which have been passed will not be worth the paper on which they have been printed. If, for instance, sectionalism is still to be dominant in N. H. and Connecticut when the only elections are to be held next spring, the South will and may well take such results as indicating that men, who mean to obey the Constitution in all its parts not of one party, but of different parties have made an earnest struggle for the right and were yet powerless. Can our people be roused to a sense of duty and obligation before it is too late. Time alone can determine. I shall write you again upon this subject and make some suggestions with regard to your property and business. In the mean time bring the latter into as narrow a compass and into a condition of perfect security, as you can—and make no new purchases or contracts. You can show this letter to Judge Potter¹ and to Genl. and John McNeil² but to nobody else.

Love to y^r wife and the boys.

Y^r affec^t Brother

FRANKLIN PIERCE

P. S. Do not fail to write me the day you receive this and direct to this City. I have no time to reread and you may find it necessary to supply words but you will I hope make out the sense and mind it.

XXII. JEFFERSON DAVIS TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

SENATE CHAMBER, Jan'y. 30, 1860.

My dear friend,

We are yet as when you sailed talking in the Senate and wrangling for organization in the House. There is a belief that Smith³ an old line Whig of North Carolina will be elected, but so many chickens have been counted from eggs which proved addled that I have no confidence in the prophecies of the House.

Govr. Dana of Me. is still here and much concerned lest our party should be divided at Charleston. I have not been able to show him how the question can be adjusted by "resolution", but have told him of the only way I have seen and which is that of nominating the man who will be accepted by both sections without a platform.

Yesterday we had our youngest boy christened Joseph Evans and wished we could have had you and Mrs. Pierce to wish a "God speed" on the journey of life.

Nicholson of Tenn.⁴ is reading a speech need I say on what, do we ever speak of anything but that over which we have no control, slavery of the negro.

¹ Judge C. E. Potter of New Hampshire, a relative of the President by marriage.

² John H. McNeil, a brother-in-law of Pierce.

³ Representative William N. H. Smith.

⁴ Senator Alfred O. P. Nicholson.

The prospect for our country is not less gloomy than when you left. The condition in which Genl. Cushing said men should provide for storm seems to be rapidly approaching. I will stand by the flag and uphold the Constitution whilst there is possibility of effecting anything to preserve and perpetuate the govt. we inherited — beyond that my duty and my faith binds me to Mississippi and her fortunes as she may shape them. I hope on for the kind providence that has preserved us heretofore, and still labor at my [post?] as a member of the general govt.

Please present my kindest remembrances and most friendly wishes to Mrs. Pierce.

Mrs. Davis would I know join me in these expressions of affection to Mrs. Pierce and also to yourself.

Hoping to hear from you often, I am as ever, truly yrs.

Presidt. F. Pierce.

JEFFN. DAVIS.

XXIII. JEFFERSON DAVIS TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON D. C. June 13, 1860.

My dear General,

Your welcome letter of the 11th inst. relieved me of speculation of your whereabouts as I have seen it stated in the newspapers that you were about to go directly to New Hampshire, but had not found a verification of the statement. It grieves me beyond expression to learn that Mrs. Pierce is ill and Mrs. Davis joins me in expression of our sympathy and affectionate regard.

We all deplore the want of unanimity as to the candidates among our Southern friends and I do not see any satisfactory solution of the difficulty. The darkest hour precedes the dawn and it may be that light will break upon us when most needed and least expected.

If your hope should be realized as to the action of the N. E. and N. Y. delegation in relation to the delegates to be admitted from the South, it will have a good effect, if they should otherwise decide in favor of the spurious delegates, the Democratic party will become historic.

Our people will support any sound man, but will not vote for a "squatter sovereignty" candidate any more than for a "free-soiler".

If northern men insist upon nominating Douglas, we must be beaten and with such alienation as leaves nothing to hope for in the future of nationality in our organization.

I have urged my friends to make an honest effort to save our party from disintegration as the last hope of averting ruin from the country. They would gladly unite upon you, or Dallas and would readily be brought to any one of like character and record.

I urged upon Mr. Minot¹ before he went to Charleston the evil effect of permitting N. H. to be mustered under the banner of Douglas, but it was of no avail. Matters are now more complicated and men are more unreasonable. Some are unwilling to go into the Convention at Balti-

¹ James Minot, formerly Pierce's law partner, and later his executor.

more and are disposed to rush blindly on dangers which they feel are at hand but do not appreciate ; others see in the crisis only the vulgar struggle of the ins and outs, and have no fear of a catastrophe ; whilst a few are willing to abandon the government to get rid of men who are unfaithful to it.

I have never seen the country in so great danger, and those who might protect it seem to be unconscious of the necessity. If our little grog-drinking, electioneering Demagogue¹ can destroy our hopes, it must be that we have been doomed to destruction.

Hoping soon to see you and in the meantime to hear from you fully, I am, as ever Cordially your friend,

JEFFN. DAVIS.

To Presidt. F. Pierce.

XXIV. A LETTER OF PIERCE ON THE SECESSION MOVEMENT.²

CONCORD, N. H., Nov. 23, 1860.

My Dear Sir.

I have just received your letter of the 21st and sympathize with all you say with regard to the inestimable value of the Union. By letters, by speeches, in private conversation, I have uttered for more than twelve years words of warning against the heresies which have swept over the North and culminated in the enactment of laws which are directly in the teeth of the clear provisions of the Constitution, in eleven states.

But you know how futile have been all patriotic counsels. I have desired to do just what you suggest, but the difficulty is to see just what as an honest man I can say.

I have never desired to survive the wreck of the Union. With submission to the Providence of God, I do not desire to live to see the day when the flag of my country, with all its stars in their places, will not float at home and abroad. But when you ask me to interpose, then comes this paralyzing fact that if I were in their places, after so many years of unrelenting aggression, I should probably be doing what they are doing.

It is not the election of Mr. Lincoln, *per se*, which has caused this emphatic movement at the South. That election is beyond all doubt Constitutional, but the people of the Southern States look beyond it to see, if they can, what it implies. They see the great and powerful state of Massachusetts electing by 35000 majority a man who justified the armed invasion of Virginia last year³; and they believe that the people of Massachusetts are acting deliberately. They see Mr. Lincoln elected and they take his election as an endorsement of his opinion that we cannot go on as we are, but must in the end be all free or all slave states. Foolish, absurd and groundless as this view is and will always stand, the

¹ Douglas.

² This letter is in the handwriting of Pierce, is unsigned and unaddressed, and bears the indorsement, "Copy of letter not sent."

³ Governor John A. Andrew.

South takes his election as an endorsement of resistance to the law for the return of fugitives from service of 1851, and of the other heresy broadly promulgated by him and Mr. Seward, referred to above, of an "irrepressible conflict".

If our fathers were mistaken when they formed the Constitution, if time has proved it, the sooner we are apart the better. I think it is all false, all wrong. I have tried to make other people believe it, but in vain. How can I urge the men of the South to take a view I should not take if I were there, a view which I do not take as a northern citizen with all I have at stake here. It is vain to talk about eloquence and appeals. Action, immediate action, on the part of the northern states which have nullified the Constitution is what is wanted and just what we cannot have. Is it not Mr. Wilson¹ who said his heel was upon the neck of the South and [who is] accepted everywhere by the people of Massachusetts? Is not Mr. Sumner, who has said more offensive things than that, equally accepted and applauded? Both are true — all is true, which they allege with regard to our aggressions on their Constitutional rights.

XXV. JEFFERSON DAVIS TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Jany. 20, 1861.

My dear friend :

I have often and sadly turned my thoughts to you during the troublous times through which we have been passing and now I come to the hard task of announcing to you that the hour is at hand which closes my connection with the United States for the independence and union of which my Father bled, and in the service of which I have sought to emulate the example he set for my guidance.

Mississippi not as a matter of choice but of necessity, has resolved to enter on the trial of secession. Those who have driven her to this alternative threaten to deprive her of the right to require that her government shall rest on the consent of the governed, to substitute foreign force for domestic support, to reduce a state to the condition from which the colony arose. In the attempt to avoid the issue which had been joined by the country, the present administration has complicated and precipitated the question. Even now if the duty "to preserve the public property" was rationally regarded, the probable collision at Charleston would be avoided. Security far better than any which the federal troops can give might be obtained in consideration of the little garrison at Fort Sumpter. If the disavowal of any purpose to coerce So. Ca. be sincere, the possession of a work to command the harbor is worse than useless.

When Lincoln comes in he will have but to continue in the path of his predecessor to inaugurate a civil war and leave a soi-disant democratic administration responsible for the fact. General Cushing² was here last week and when we parted it seemed like taking a last leave of a Brother.

¹ Henry Wilson, colleague of Charles Sumner, as senator from Massachusetts.

² Caleb Cushing.

I leave immediately for Mississippi and know not what may devolve upon me after my return. Civil war has only horror for me, but whatever circumstances demand shall be met as a duty and I trust be so discharged that you will not be ashamed of our former connection or cease to be my friend.

I had hoped this summer to have had an opportunity to see you and Mrs. Pierce and to have shown you our children. Mrs. Davis was sorely disappointed when we turned southward without seeing you. I believe she wrote Mrs. Pierce in explanation of the circumstances which prevented us from executing our cherished plan of a visit to you when we should leave West Point.

Mrs. Davis joins me in kind remembrance to Mrs. Pierce and the expression of the hope that we may yet have you both at our country home. Do me the favor to write me often. Address Hurricane P. O., Warren County, Miss.

May God bless you is ever the prayer of your friend

JEFFN. DAVIS.

President F. Pierce.

XXVI. FRANKLIN PIERCE TO BISHOP CARLTON CHASE.¹

HILLSBORO, May 6, 1861.

My dear Sir,

The perusal of your cordial note of the 22nd. inst. afforded me great satisfaction. The condition of our country, superinduced to a great extent by the wrong and persistent moral aggression of the North, but to a still greater extent by the arrogant rashness of the South, is to the last degree deplorable. What is to become of the republic, seems to me, to be beyond the grasp of human wisdom.

We cannot subjugate the Southern States, if we would. The idea that they can subjugate the Northern, Middle and Northwestern States, is simply preposterous. And yet in the face of these propositions, to which all intelligent minds assent, the masses of the people on both sides are apparently hurried forward against the plainest dictates of reason and humanity, as if stricken with judicial madness.

I enjoy the memories which you express of my venerated father and reciprocate your desire for the honest grasp of the hand, especially in a time like this.

I am glad our hearts, and if need be, our hands, are likely to go together in the fearful emergency which confronts us. The loss of life is much. The want of those who depend for their daily bread upon their daily labor is much. The loss of property, so far as I am concerned, is nothing. But the loss of my country — the overthrow of what I esteem the last hope of civil liberty is fearful.

¹ Episcopalian bishop, consecrated first bishop of New Hampshire in 1844. Was rector for twenty-four years in Bellows Falls, Vt.; later was rector in Claremont, N. H.

If I can I will, in a week or two see you at Claremont. If this may not be

Believe me truly, Your friend,
Bishop Carlton Chase, FRANKLIN PIERCE.
Claremont, N. H.

XXVII. CHIEF JUSTICE R. B. TANEY TO FRANKLIN PIERCE.

WASHINGTON June 12, 1861.

My dear sir :

I left Baltimore before your kind letter reached that city and it has been forwarded to me here.

Your cordial approbation of my decision in the case of the Habeas Corpus has given me sincere pleasure. In the present state of the public mind inflamed with passion and seeking to accomplish its object by force of arms, I was sensible of the grave responsibility which the case of John Merryman cast upon me. But my duty was plain — and that duty required me to meet the question directly and firmly, without evasion — whatever might be the consequences to myself.

The paroxysm of passion into which the country has suddenly been thrown, appears to me to amount almost to delirium. I hope that it is too violent to last long, and that calmer and more sober thoughts will soon take its place: and that the North, as well as the South, will see that a peaceful separation, with free institutions in each section, is far better than the union of all the present states under a military government, and a reign of terror preceded too by a civil war with all its horrors, and which end as it may will prove ruinous to the victors as well as the vanquished. But at present I grieve to say passion and hate sweep everything before them.

Accept, dear sir, the highest respect and best wishes of

Your friend and servt.

R. B. TANEY.

Franklin Pierce, Ex-President of the U. S.
Concord, New Hampshire.

XXVIII. FRANKLIN PIERCE TO HONORABLE JAMES A. PEARCE.¹

CONCORD N. H. January 15, 1862

My dear Sir —

I read with unusual interest and satisfaction, the debate, which occurred in the Senate on the 16th ult., upon the resolution of Mr Trumbull,² and desire to express my thanks for the sentiments and thoughts, which the occasion elicited from you.

¹ Senator from Maryland.

² On December 12, 1861, Lyman Trumbull, senator from Illinois, introduced the following resolution: "Resolved, That the Secretary of State be directed to inform the Senate whether, in the loyal States of the Union, any person or persons have been arrested and imprisoned and are now held in confinement by orders from him or his Department; and, if so, under what law said arrests have been made, and said persons imprisoned." *Congressional Globe*, 37 Congress, 2 Session, Part I, 67. For the debate referred to, see *ibid.*, 90 ff.

My convictions and sympathies are with you thoroughly, when you say, "I do not believe that it (imprisonment upon *lettres de cachet*) promotes the purposes of those, who desire to see this union brought together again, an object, to me, of all others the most desirable, if it be possible." In my estimation the mover of the enquiry deserves the gratitude of freemen everywhere, and only utters truth with force, when he declares, that, "the power, without charge, without examination, without opportunity of reply, at the click of the telegraph, to arrest a man in a peaceable portion of the Country and imprison him" is "of the essence of despotism." And yet, the public mind thus far, would seem to have been scarcely more roused, by current events of this character, than it was years ago, when we received accounts of similar incarcerations, ordered by the father, of the now deposed King of the Two Sicilies. How incredible it will appear hereafter, when history shall be written up, that at this period of the Republic, the constitutional safeguards of personal liberty, could have been so easily and with so little apparent concern, swept away.

The Secretary of State,¹ on the 20th ult., four days after the debate in which you participated, addressed an *official* note to me, which serves to illustrate, in a striking manner, the slight grounds, or rather the groundless suspicions, upon which, in these times, citizens are liable to suffer in reputation, if not in loss of liberty. I replied without delay, and so far as I am personally affected, may, I trust, well leave the matter, in quietness, upon the files of the Department. It is my belief, however, that no recent measure, has been fraught with more mischief, than the issuing of *lettres de cachet*, and consequent arrests and imprisonments in violation of the provisions of the Constitution; and that the earlier the system is effectually checked, the better it will be, for the Government and the Country, as well as for the subjects of oppression. The evidence is abundant to show, that the plea of *necessity*, except in the presence or immediate neighbourhood of hostile armies, where the administration of law, under its usual forms, may be inevitably suspended, is not graciously accepted by the mass of the people. Union, without security for personal liberty, is not the Union, which they have cherished and to the restoration of which they look, with earnest desire and hope. Nothing, perhaps, could express more clearly their views, on this point, than the language of the great modern historian, who died, at a comparatively recent period, leaving his work incomplete. In tracing the successive steps in the progress of British liberty, he says, "We have been taught by long experience, that we cannot without danger, suffer any breach of the Constitution to pass unnoticed" — "As we cannot, without the risk of evils, from which imagination recoils, employ physical force as a check on misgovernment, it is evidently our wisdom to keep all constitutional checks on misgovernment in the highest state of efficiency, to watch with jealousy the first beginnings of encroachment, and never to suffer irregu-

¹ Seward.

larities, even when harmless in themselves, to pass unchallenged, lest they acquire the force of precedents." Who in our land will affirm, that any other doctrine is worthy of those, who hold their rights under a solemn written charter? It is cheering to know, that enquiry has been moved in the right quarter, and that able and fearless men are stirred by a sense of what is due to our fellow-citizens, who have been imprisoned, without assignment of cause and discharged without explanation; and yet more to such as are still in confinement and, precluded by guards and prison doors from the privilege of the great writ of liberty, and thus from confronting, before a competent judicial tribunal, imputation, which the act of imprisonment itself implies. Of this latter class, I believe from my knowledge of the men, are not a few worthy sons of Maryland, who love the union, as you do, and who have striven, not to destroy, but to preserve it. If free from any taint of crime, as I take them to be, they will derive unfailing capacity for endurance, from consciousness, that they have never nourished their manly strength to strike stout blows at the foundations, which the fathers laid, that they have never participated in lines of action or in startling utterances calculated to encourage aggression upon the rights and institutions of Sovereign States, to foster sectional distrust and animosity, or to inaugurate conflict between different parts of the Confederation, and thus to weaken unity of feeling, interest and purpose. If, on the other hand, they are guilty, the law will inflict adequate punishment, whatever that may be, as it should do. But how long is such durance, without a hearing, to be their allotment?

I am, very truly,

Yr friend

FRANKLIN. PIERCE

Hon James A. Pearce

U. S. Senate

Washington D. C.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Outlines of Greek History, with a Survey of Ancient Oriental Nations. By WILLIAM C. MOREY, Ph.D., D.C.L. (New York: The American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 378.)

AMID the hosts of text-books which are crowding upon us each new-comer finds it more and more difficult to justify its appearance. Yet, notwithstanding the multiplicity of its rivals, Mr. Morey's little book should make a place for itself. Intended, in connection with his *Outlines of Roman History*, to provide "a complete course in ancient history", the present work exhibits in general the same merits for which the earlier was conspicuous — nice discrimination in the selection of relevant material, balance and proportion in arrangement, and clearness and simplicity in presentation. Although the author's primary aim is the instruction of the uninitiated youth, he shows himself to be *au courant* with the views of the most reliable recent writers, at least when they are accessible in English, for it is not so clear that he has made use of Beloch and Busolt.

The rather kaleidoscopic survey of oriental nations contains helpful generalizations concerning the various peoples touched upon, although the names of many of the persons and institutions, which doubtless have to be mentioned, will be difficult and confusing to the young reader. In dealing with the Greek people, whose history naturally occupies the bulk of the work, the author keeps steadily in view the aim of choosing such facts as will illustrate their peculiar characteristics and their contributions to posterity: in the political field their capacity for developing free local institutions and their inability to weld themselves into a national union; in the non-political field their unique achievements in art, literature, philosophy, and science. The periodic surveys of Greek life and thought are particularly to be commended. The amount of space devoted to them necessitates a corresponding curtailment in the account of political and military affairs; for instance, a detailed picture of Athenian life and thought in the Periclean age is followed by the briefest outline of the events of the Peloponnesian war, a division which some even of the more recent writers with Thucydides before them have shrunk from; epoch-making battles like Salamis and Platea are dismissed with a bare mention, although accompanying diagrams help to supply the deficiency in the text. This pardonable brevity, however, involves the omission of some helpful considerations; for example, the rivalry of Athens and Corinth for the control of the western sea-route as a factor in determining the decision of the former with regard to Corcyra; Sparta's stupidity in destroying the Chalcidian league, a useful buffer against the Macedonian advance; or, to go further afield, Bury's suggestive conjec-

tures on the limitations of existing geographical knowledge as a justification for Alexander's extreme eastern conquests. Moreover, the rise of Macedon and the period of the Roman intervention are covered in too summary a fashion.

Naturally in a book of this character it is possible to challenge, or at least to question, many of the statements. To cite a few examples: p. 81, it has been thought that the migrations to the eastern Ægean began even before the Dorian conquest of the Peloponnesus; p. 84, Busolt shows good reason for questioning the customary view that the Phœnicians founded Thebes; p. 90, there were not only one but two systems of writing in Crete; p. 93, possibly the oriental influence on Mycenæan art is too much emphasized; p. 100, Hesiod should have been mentioned with Homer as a formative influence on Greek religion; p. 128, in stating that Solon is said to have visited Crœsus, although some writers now believe it possible, no mention is made of the difficulty of reconciling the traditional dates; p. 130, doubt has been recently cast upon the twofold expulsion of Pisistratus; p. 151, it is not stated that the original center of the Amphictyonic league was at Anthela and that the league continued to hold one of its annual meetings there after it began to meet at Delphi; p. 174, the traditional story of Histiaeus's share in instigating the Ionian revolt is omitted without reason; p. 226, the list of liturgies is not complete; p. 232, it is not clear from the text whether one or two older temples preceded the Erechtheum there described; p. 252, it is at least an open question whether members of the Athenian Assembly were paid under Pericles; p. 284, the tyrant Gelon might at least have been mentioned; p. 288, the *Hellenica* goes further than the close of the Peloponnesian war; p. 307, the extent of Aristotle's influence on Alexander has been questioned. Many teachers will welcome the long-sanctioned usage of spelling Greek names in the Romanized form. The maps are frequent and helpful, and the classified bibliography is reasonably ample and well-chosen, though it hardly seems that Lawton's useful little *Introduction to Classical Greek Literature* appeared too late for insertion.

ARTHUR LYON CROSS.

History of the Moorish Empire in Europe. By S. P. SCOTT. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1904. Three vols., pp. xlii, 761; ix, 686; ix, 696.)

A SATISFYING history of the Muslim dominion in Spain has been long awaited both by the historical student and by the general reader. It is likely to be awaited still. Mr. Scott's three volumes are obviously the result of conscientious and comprehensive reading in some half-dozen languages, but their author lacks the historical temperament. His work, though not without a certain old-fashioned dignity of style, is too monotonous to be popular and too uncritical in its affirmations to content the trained student of history. It seems a pity that after covering thirty-seven

pages with a list of the authorities consulted in constructing his book he should be unwilling to tell us in a single foot-note the source of any specific statement. One does not like to be captious in the case of a scholar who has devoted twenty years to his task, but as he declines to supply us with citations by which his statements may be tested, it is not unfair, perhaps, to estimate the accuracy of his scholarship by the asseverations of various sorts which find expression in these pages. There is not much excuse nowadays, for example, to locate "the Ophir of Holy Writ" (I, 134) in northern Africa, nor is it exact to refer to Arabia as the only country "accessible to the ambition of the powerful sovereigns of antiquity" that "escaped the humiliation of conquest" (I, 10), since both Esarhaddon and Asurbanipal conquered the region, though they did not long control it. His reference to the Berbers as an "undoubtedly Semitic race" (I, 136) would not satisfy most modern ethnologists, nor can we understand the mental process of a close student of this particular group of the families of mankind who attributes to the Semites "an extraordinary capacity for political organization" (I, 15). If there is any quality notably absent in the Semitic race, we should have said that it is that of political discipline. The author's whole work is a complete refutation of this assertion, for the collapse of the Arab power—as he takes pains to insist—was everywhere more the result of their racial incapacity to rise above the political conceptions of the tribal state than of superior ability or bravery on the part of their foes. In illustration of this nothing could be more apt than his criticism of the policy of a king's arbitrary selection of his successor, a policy sanctioned by Mohammedan custom, and "in no trifling degree responsible for the Western Khalifate's ultimate overthrow". "In this respect", he adds, "its history is but the counterpart of every other Moslem power. The ideas dominating the various constituents of the society of Islam were incompatible with either the just subordination of classes or the permanence of empire."

The main contention supported in Mr. Scott's elaborate thesis is that the conquest of Spain and its recovery by Europeans was a struggle between civilizations rather than between races or religions. The Gothic Christians went down in the eighth century before a higher type of culture, better fitted to fight and live off the soil. The causes of their ultimate success against the Muslims lay, first, in the evolution of a national group formed of Goths, Iberians, and Basques welded into one by the pressure of defeat and the need of union against a common enemy; second, in the introduction of feudalism, by which the new group secured a serviceable system of government; and third, in the disintegration apparently inevitable among Arab communities. The process was very slow. The Asturian kingdom and the Gothic march became the scenes of incessant incursions with varying results, but they bred at last a race of indefatigable warriors who gradually acquired their lessons of obedience and discipline. The nation thus engendered succeeded at length through the exercise of its one great quality, persistency, in extirpating a race intellectually and economically its superior. Its victory and the result-

ing loss to civilization and humanity the author considers an unmitigated misfortune. Since the Spaniards would learn nothing from their hated enemy, the finest culture of the middle ages expired without transmitting to semibarbarous Europe anything more than a faint trace of its acquirements and intellectual energy. From the moment of her supreme effort Spain has remained supine and inept, unwilling to change, an incumbrance upon the states of Christendom. It has been the triumph of an inferior over a superior civilization.

This view, while not entirely novel, differs from that of European historians in making little of race as a factor in the result and in denying to Christianity any real influence whatever in the operation. Both Teutonic and Semitic groups, we are told, "traced their lineage to tribes steeped in barbarism and idolatry", but while the former persisted in the poverty, ignorance, and ferocity of its ancestors the latter became possessed of accomplishments that rendered it "opulent, polished and dissolute beyond all example, but eventually and inevitably enervated and decadent". Why? The anthropological side of the problem does not appear to interest the author. In his attitude toward the Christian church, however, he shows a mighty earnestness, not to say contentiousness of tone. It is quite time that the West should be made aware of certain superior features in Oriental civilization and of the truculence and bigotry of medieval priests, but to exalt the Arab mind above all others in capacity for improvement and to deny to the institution of Christianity a single saving grace during seven centuries is excessive. Every student is entitled to his own point of view, but it would be hard to justify such lapses in tone and temper as are to be found in this narrative or to forgive the author the extravagance of his praise of the Moors. In these essential items he himself lies subject to the charge of lacking in philosophical discrimination which he brings against the "illiterate analysts" of the Latin priesthood.

The scope of Mr. Scott's work is amply inclusive. Two volumes cover the whole period of Moorish occupation in the peninsula, while the third contains *kulturgeschichtliche* material of some interest and value. This is brought forward in the form of a series of essays on the arts, institutions, and influence of the Muslims, as well as on the Jews and the Moriscoes in Spain. There is evidence of plenty of learning, but here again we may perhaps be pardoned for wishing to know the authorities consulted by an author who calmly declares his conviction that "no achievement of ancient or modern times was perfected with such rapidity or produced such decided effects upon the intellectual progress of the human race as the Mohammedan Conquest of Spain". A word of praise should be given to the publishers for the admirable appearance of these handsome volumes, the print and covers of which are all that a dignified historical work demands.

F. W. WILLIAMS.

The History of North America. Edited by GUY CARLETON LEE, Ph.D. Vol. I. *Discovery and Exploration.* By ALFRED BRITAIN, in conference with GEORGE EDWARD REED, LL.D., S.T.D. Vol. II. *The Indians of North America in Historic Times.* By CYRUS THOMAS, Ph.D., in conference with W. J. MCGEE, LL.D. Vol. III. *The Colonization of the South.* By PETER JOSEPH HAMILTON. Vol. IV. *The Colonization of the Middle States and Maryland.* By FREDERICK ROBERTSON JONES, Ph.D. (Philadelphia: George Barrie and Sons. 1904. Pp. xxiv, 511; xx, 464; xxiii, 494; xxiv, 523.)

A WORK announced as "The first definitive, authoritative, and inclusive narrative history of North America" should indeed be furnished with worthy sponsors, and none more worthy could be found than those claimed for this series — Johns Hopkins University and the American Historical Association. The critical, however, will desire to know the exact relationship between these organizations and the work in question. The editor tells us that "for almost a decade" "the Johns Hopkins University group of authors" has had some such project in mind, and that when the American Historical Association decided not to undertake the task, they at once took up the plan it had outlined, and, modifying it in some respects, pushed it to completion. On examining the list of twenty authors, described as "specialists, mostly from the Johns Hopkins group", we find that four hold degrees from the department of History, Politics, and Economics of that university. None of these men is now connected with it, but the editor holds the position of instructor in history. With one exception, these men have attained the doctorate within the last ten years, the editor in 1898. They therefore do not belong to the generation which made the reputation of the university; they have their own reputation yet to make, and must have been graduate students when they conceived their ambitious project.

A plan proposed to the American Historical Association has indeed been in part followed, but this plan was never indorsed by the Association and was but the barest sketch, merely suggesting coöperation under the direction of an editor-in-chief, and publication in twenty volumes, each complete in itself. In other respects the connection of the Association with the history has been still more slight. Of three hundred and twenty-nine persons mentioned as "authors", as members of the "editorial board", "board of advisers on exclusion and inclusion", "board of advisers on colonial affairs", "board of military and naval advisers", and as giving "courteous attention, valuable assistance, encouragement, or approval", not one has ever served the Association as an officer, and only ten as members of any standing committee, commission, or board. The greater number of those thus mentioned seem to have given the courteous attention which custodians of historical collections are accustomed to extend to all duly accredited students. If,

as would seem to be the case, the list last mentioned indicates all the libraries consulted, it is curious that it contains no names outside the United States.

In the plan of the series, volumes II, *The Indians of North America in Historic Times*, and XIX, *Prehistoric North America*, should certainly change places. The lack of separate accounts of European conditions leading to colonization and of American physiography is not supplied by discussions in any of the four volumes so far issued, and will be serious if not provided for. It would seem hardly necessary to assure the reader, as the publishers do, that the work is "non-sectional, non-partisan, non-sectarian". Yet one doubts if a history is properly called non-sectional which presents two accounts of the Civil War, one from a Northern and one from a Southern standpoint. It is to be hoped that it is not to be kept non-sectarian by the exclusion of religious history, as seems to be foreshadowed in Mr. Jones's treatment of the Quakers. The illustrations are well chosen and exquisitely reproduced, but are not so arranged as to illustrate the neighboring text. There are no foot-notes or bibliographies.

Mr. Brittain's volume, *Discovery and Exploration*, is the first of the series. Much more than half of it is composed of quotations from the voyagers themselves and their friends. It is very readable, but necessarily the proportions are determined more by the material available than by the relative importance of the voyages. Out of 502 pages 199 are devoted to the journal of Columbus. Some critical apparatus is furnished for judging this and the letters of Vespucci, but the writings of Bernal Diaz are presented without a word of warning. The text written by Mr. Brittain seems hardly definitive. His style is loose and his meaning is often obscure. His handling of evidence is inadequate, and few scholars will agree that, "There is no difficulty, and there can be no reasonable doubt, in identifying Helluland with Newfoundland, Markland with Nova Scotia, and Vinland with New England. Indeed, the description of the coast is so accurate that in the island between which and the ness Erik sailed it is easy to recognize Nantucket" (p. 16).

One takes up Mr. Thomas's *The Indians of North America in Historic Times* with a feeling of expectation and lays it down with disappointment. There would seem to be half a dozen points of view from which a man of Mr. Thomas's equipment might write such a history with profit, but he avoids them all. His method is to take sections of territory, beginning with the West Indies and Central America, and to discuss the history of each Indian tribe in the section from its first contact with the white man to the present day. The consequence is that on page 11 the dates 1570 and "now" jostle each other; on page 316 the dates 1714 and 1890; and so throughout. Occasionally the sectional method is suspended to allow a continuous treatment of some migrating tribe, yet the account of the Iroquois is divided between two widely-separated chapters. Somewhat more than half the book is concerned with Indian wars, which are discussed with a knowledge of detail and an appreciation of Indian character that increases one's regret that

the plan is not more comprehensive ; but even here the important is sacrificed to the trivial. No reference is made to the strategic position occupied by the Iroquois ; and the Fox wars in Wisconsin, which impoverished the treasury of New France, are dismissed in a page and a third. Indian trade is almost ignored, and the triangular struggle between the French, the Dutch (and their successors, the English), and the Iroquois to get control of that trade is not mentioned. Hardly any information is given as to the influence of the white man on Indian character and civilization. The drink problem, the blessing which the white man conferred by introducing the horse and the blanket, the curse of European disease, the working of the Spanish missionary settlements, and the changes wrought by intermarriage are totally neglected. Mr. Thomas is quite right in distinguishing between the policy of the United States toward the Indian and the execution of that policy, but in treating "the history of the Indians as it stands apart from that of the white race", it is certainly the execution of the policy that should be emphasized. Mr. Thomas, however, deals almost exclusively with rather technical questions of land title and the legal status of the tribes. The last chapter, "The Indians as a Race and as a Factor in American History", is very suggestive. The book will have a permanent value as an encyclopedia of Indian tribes and wars.

Mr. Hamilton furnishes a charming and valuable volume on *The Colonization of the South*. Readers of his *Colonial Mobile* will find no new contributions to knowledge, and in a definitive history it is perhaps unfortunate to change, as he does, the center of interest which we have commonly accepted from Virginia to the Gulf of Mexico, giving one hundred and ninety-three pages exclusively to the French and Spanish colonies and one hundred and eighty-five to the English. Such criticisms seem captious, however, in view of the novel suggestiveness of the treatment and the firm handling of the material. It is a book worth the reading of historian and layman alike.

Mr. Jones's *The Colonization of the Middle States and Maryland* attains no distinction and merits no particular reproach.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

History of the United States of America. By HENRY WILLIAM ELSON. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. xxxii, 911, xl.)

In a single volume, approximating one thousand pages, Mr. Elson has endeavored to satisfy the frequently heard demand for a history of the United States from the earliest to the latest times compressed into one book. Of the result, one may not safely predict that it is the final effort ; that no one will have the courage later to attempt it again. On the other hand, it is within the bounds of safe prophecy to say that the work will be accepted as more nearly approaching the ideal than any previously attempted. It must not be compared with the volume in the Cambridge

series, for instance, because it seeks a different constituency. Perhaps the author may be allowed to state his purpose. In the preface he says :

For many years I have contemplated writing a history of the United States in a single volume, that should fall between the elaborate works, which are beyond the reach of most busy people, and the condensed school histories, which are emasculated of all literary style through the necessity of crowding so many facts into small space. In writing this history my aim has been to present an accurate narrative of the origin and growth of our country and its institutions in such a form as to interest the general reader. I have constantly borne in mind the great importance of combining the science of historical research with the art of historical composition.

Judged by his own standard, Mr. Elson has achieved no small degree of success. He is far and away superior to many preceding "popular" writers. Where one finds a vast amount of fine writing and universal affirmatives in preceding compositions of this order, he finds here facts and an abundance of them. Instead of statements resting on no foundation save that they have been used by writers since American history was first put into type, this author has used documents and has cited and even quoted them. Instead of being a compiler, he shows himself to be a writer. Some specific instances may be cited to show the improvement over the popular history which makes its way in the world chiefly by solicitation. It was inevitable that there should be a chapter on the manners and habits of the aborigines. But in addition to the hackneyed matter, appears a discussion of the future of the Indians, together with a map showing the location of the various Indian reservations. The author follows beaten paths in the wars, but in the details of the campaigns and battles of the Civil War, for instance, finds space to include the rise and fall of the Confederate government, the various emancipation steps of the Federal government, and the foreign relations of both governments. Nor has he in the Revolutionary War allowed the military side to eclipse the development of civil authority as has frequently been done. Means of transportation, growth of inventions, and the movement of the people find proper if not due place.

Although the author has made use of the results of recent investigations more fully than did his predecessors, it cannot be conceded that he has left nothing to be desired. He has profited by many of the latest pamphlets and even addresses. Marcus Whitman no longer rides to Washington and saves Oregon. But the expedition of George Rogers Clark "enabled the Americans at the close of the war to claim successfully the vast prairie region of Illinois as a possession of the United States" (p. 292). No scientific investigation of the documents in the case could warrant this statement. The index to Wharton's *Diplomatic Correspondence of the American Revolution* does not even contain the name of Clark. Another vestigium of the body historical, not warranted by investigation or by utility, is to be found in the apocryphal statement (p. 254) that the "news of the great act [the passing of the Declaration of Independ-

dence] rang forth to the expectant city in joyful peals of the old bell in the tower of the statehouse, and the people were thrown into a state of delirious joy". There may have been delirium in old Philadelphia, but it was not caused by the bells, which according to Marshall's *Remembrancer*, were not rung until the Monday following. "Ring, grandpa, ring, O ring for liberty", is not in harmony with the "science of historical research". Nor has investigation proved that the Quebec Act "was intended to prevent pioneers from settling in the Ohio country and to win the favor of the Roman Catholics" (p. 234).

Aside from these few instances where the author has followed oft-reiterated statements instead of the path he set for himself, it is inevitable in such a mass of names that variations of spelling should be found. "Spottswood" (p. 73) is one; Captain "Grey" (p. 387), the discoverer of the Columbia River, is another. "The powerful judicial mind of the rising Chief Justice, John Marshall," (p. 336) in the Virginia constitutional convention (1788) looks rather anachronistic. The name of James Bowdoin is omitted from the list of delegates elected by Massachusetts to attend the first Continental Congress (p. 235). Hancock and Samuel Adams, hiding in the swamp near Woburn during the hostilities of April 19, would have been delighted to have "quietly proceeded on their way to the Congress at Philadelphia" (p. 238) after having been aroused by Paul Revere at Dr. Clark's house. The first Continental Congress can scarcely be called "less a congress than a national committee, an advisory council of continental magnitude" (p. 236). It was in reality a congress—something which it has never been since it abandoned consultation for lawmaking.

But this is quibbling criticism. In its larger aspects, the book is well-proportioned. The first fourth brings the story to the Revolution; the second fourth to Monroe's second term; the third to the Civil War, say 1863; and the fourth to the Isthmian canal treaty with Panama. As the volume includes the treatment of recent events, political bias may be looked for. But it will be sought in vain. A caustic critic of the Republican reconstruction policy and a strong admirer of President Cleveland, the author is also a supporter of a strong foreign policy and a severe commentator on the lack of anti-tariff sentiment in the Democratic party. As between North and South in the irrepressible conflict, he is so fair that only a rabid partizan of either side is likely to gainsay his statements.

Mr. Elson will be considered unfortunate in having marked so strongly in his preface the line to which he intends to hew. He says, "Knowing that many intelligent people who wish to know something of their country are not fond of reading history, I have given careful attention to style, in the hope that the book might be easy and pleasurable to read, as well as instructive." Whether readers are to be lured by striking figures, by vigor of expression, or by beauty of description is not specified. Grotesqueness would scarcely be elected as a legitimate attraction. Yet no doubt readers would be attracted by some of the figures of speech which the author employs. Take, to illustrate, a

description (p. 371) of Jefferson: "The great Republican leader, from the irresponsible watch-tower of the vice presidency, had for four years watched the political chessboard with eagle eye." An eagle in a watch-tower playing chess is not bad as an attraction. It is also open to question whether a careful attention to style would include mention of the disease with which President Grant was afflicted, or of the sum received by his widow for the publication of his *Memoirs*. But these are purely matters of taste.

If one were to predict to what class this addition to American histories would be useful, he would think of the busy man who wishes condensed information in connected form; of the home library where general reading rather than intensive study is done; of the many uses to which a condensed and yet detailed description of the course of United States history could be put. Considering the difficulty of condensing and yet not omitting, one thinks of this book as Dr. Johnson thought of a woman preaching — not as being surprisingly well done, but as being done at all.

EDWIN E. SPARKS.

A School History of the United States. By PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE. (New York: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 378, 36.)

A History of the United States. By WADDY THOMPSON. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. 1904. Pp. x, 489, xxxvi.)

THE most evident purpose of Mr. Bruce's book is use in southern schools, yet those subjects which no Northerner is supposed to be able to handle delicately enough not to hurt Southern sensibilities are treated so mildly and fairly in the main that the book might be used north of the Mason and Dixon line without offending any one. Nullification, slavery, and even secession are touched upon in such a non-committal way and so little explained that they pass almost unnoticed in the book. We have no quarrel with the author on account of his politics or sectionalism; his errors are rather of omission and emphasis and point of view.

To the principles of the Quakers Mr. Bruce gives but a clause of a brief sentence (p. 82). Of their political influence there is nothing. A sentence that a student would never notice (p. 32) is all that explains the beginning of French exploration in America. There is no account of conditions in France that influenced exploration or colonization. Bacon's Rebellion (p. 54) has no political meaning for Mr. Bruce. Champlain's fight with the Iroquois is told to liven the narrative with a fight (p. 36), but the far-reaching result is merely hinted in a manner that means nothing to one who doesn't know. The ideals and purposes of the Jesuits are not mentioned. They strut upon the stage a moment as missionaries and then they are no more. There is no hint of the dissensions between England and America until within ten pages of Lexington and Concord. For Mr. Bruce the Revolution is nothing but a fight.

The great political changes, the turning of theories into practical political experiments, are ignored. The significance of the "Conway Cabal" is not noticed; it is only a jealous intrigue by certain men. The French alliance is still, for Mr. Bruce, the work of Franklin alone, the great missionary who converted a nation; other motives there are none. The value and importance of Clark's expedition is not even suggested. The Loyalists are ignored and the state constitutions forgotten. The Confederation and state dissensions get half a page apiece, and yet in a book of 378 pages fifty are given to the American Revolution. The Whisky Insurrection has no significance for the author except that it was a riot and was quelled. On the whole there is simply the old narrative of events common to text-books of twenty years ago, with no attempt to explain the meaning of events. There is too much grouping of matter under proper names, instead of under headings indicative of the character of the action, its purpose or meaning. The student's attention is thus called to names and not to institutions, or principles, or political movements. If the South must be fed on this pabulum because it cannot endure the biased views of Northern scholars, it ought to have historical indigestion.

That the author of the *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* should have given us such a faulty history is surprising. Much of the result of the best scholarship devoted to American history seems unknown to him. The proportions of the work especially seem to show this fact. Again, there is almost no pedagogical apparatus, no other book is mentioned from cover to cover, and the text thus becomes the law and the gospel, though the presence of the old disproved story of Clark's capture of Kaskaskia while a dance was going on (p. 148), and other such errors of fact, convince us that the work can lay no claim to infallibility. The maps are poor, though reasonably accurate, but the pictures are absurd beyond belief. Nearly all are fanciful and in no way correct historically. Hideous, impossible Indians are shown scalping horror-stricken, unbelievable colonists; and (p. 67) a Puritan gallant dressed as if for a ball is pictured gracefully handing out of a boat the lovely Puritan maiden with curls and a pretty white apron. Nathaniel Bacon, the leader of the rebellious farmers, appears in correct costume for an English soldier of that day, and behind him are ranks of helmeted soldiers as if on dress-parade. One is taken back to the days of Ridpath by such absurd illustrations as these.

The preface to Mr. Thompson's book offers no pedagogical theory except to make the pupils "proud of an American heritage", to eliminate prejudice, and to point out "the marvelous progress of America". The author's idea of historical proportion is indicated by his opening sentence: "The chief event in American history is the war between the states." This dictum he acts upon by devoting over one-fifth of the book to that subject. Though he nowhere gives offense by ultra-Southern views, yet he suggests his state of mind (p. 407) in the assertion, "Though war never did, and never can, determine which view of a con-

troversty is right, yet it can decide that the view held by the victor shall prevail . . . Secession perished by the sword." It is needless to add that Mr. Thompson dwells with great unction upon the attempts of northern states at nullification, and his paragraph upon New England resistance to the embargo acts (p. 245) he heads "The Secession Movement Again". The book is, of course, like that by Mr. Bruce, intended for southern schools. It has many of the faults of the other, but is on the whole better. His point of view in the early period is much better. Instead of beginning with the Indians, he gets the student's mind upon Europe and the conditions there which led to the discovery of America. The Norse voyage, too, is not given such prominence as to spoil the student's measure of its importance. The omissions are in most cases of the same character as those in Mr. Bruce's work. Actual errors are not so frequent, though there are some inexcusable ones. South Carolina is said (p. 171) to have gone further than those states that had provisional governments, by adopting in March, 1776, a "complete independent government", but the preamble of the constitution itself shows that it was temporary like the others. Again (p. 206) it is asserted that in the Confederation "The affirmative vote of nine states in Congress was required for the passage of acts", but the fact is that only certain definite acts required nine votes for passage. In places the book is badly arranged, as is especially seen in some of the sequences. Without showing any relation whatsoever, the following subjects (pp. 230-232) are strung along on a chronological string: national bank, amendments, political parties, the mint, election, cotton-gin, and Indian troubles. This is but one example of sequences found throughout the book. The illustrations are much better than those in Mr. Bruce's work, and the style of writing is far more interesting.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late LORD ACTON, LL.D. Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., and STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Vol. II. *The Reformation.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xxiv, 857.)

THE second volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* is devoted to "The Reformation". It is too bad that we find it so hard to adopt a less misleading term for the events of the first half of the sixteenth century. The expression "Reformation" fairly pullulates with popular misapprehensions, and it would seem that Lord Acton, devout Catholic as he was, would gladly have sanctioned the use of the accurate term "Protestant Revolt", or "Protestant Revolution". It is needless to say that those who contribute to the volume have in general emancipated themselves from the old conception of the Reformation, and occupy the position defined by Maurenbrecher some three decades ago in his *Studien und Skizzen*. Perhaps the best proof of this emancipation lies in the fact

that no one has ventured, in the volume before us, to discuss the general significance and results of the Protestant Revolt—although it will be remembered that Mr. Lea had a word to say of them at the close of volume I.

Chapter I, upon "Medicean Rome", by the late Professor F. X. Kraus, of Freiburg,¹ is a notable one. The subject could not have been assigned to a more able scholar in the field, and it is treated with a breadth and insight truly refreshing. It was doubtless contributions of just this kind that the editors had in mind when their great undertaking was first planned out. In some of the chapters, it must be confessed, however, one is disappointed to find no more than any studious person of mediocre attainments could get together from the current manuals. Professor Kraus has given us the ripest results of his long preoccupation with the relations of art and Christianity. Julius II, whether or not he was conscious of his object, really effected the reconciliation of Christianity with the enthusiasm for classical literature toward which many of the most enlightened humanists had been struggling. To Professor Kraus the *Camera della Segnatura* of Raphael is the splendid portrayal of this reconciliation. This and other of Raphael's frescos in the Vatican "are the highest to which Christian art has attained, and the thoughts which they express are one of the greatest achievements of the Papacy. The principle elsewhere laid down is here reaffirmed: that the reception of the true Renaissance into the circle of ecclesiastical thought points to a widening of the limited medieval conception into universality, and indicates a transition to entire and actual Catholicity, like the great step taken by Paul, when he turned to the Gentiles and released the community from the limits of Judaistic teaching" (p. 7). This expansion and elevation of the intellectual sphere is the most glorious achievement of Julius II and of the Papacy at the beginning of modern times. There is nothing in the reign of his successor comparable to it. Leo X indeed seems but a second-rate character when compared with Julius. "Despite the noble and generous way in which his reign began the Pope soon fell into an effeminate life of self-indulgence spent among players and buffoons, a life rich in undignified farce and offensive jests, but poor in every kind of positive achievement. The Pope laughed, hunted, and gambled; he enjoyed the papacy" (p. 14).

After completing Professor Kraus's brilliant chapter, we are invited to plod through the political history, from Marignano to Cateau-Cambrésis, under the guidance of Mr. Stanley Leathes, who appears to have been designated among the editors as the hewer of wood and drawer of water. It will seem to a good many readers that his contributions may be safely skipped; although it is easy to see why the editors feel that, with the conventional notions of history, such chapters as his should be scattered through the various volumes in order to insure the feeling that we are on solid ground.

¹ By some inadvertence this distinguished scholar is attributed to Munich in the work before us.

Luther is given a chapter by the Reverend T. M. Lindsay. While the writer deals with unimpeachable accuracy with the commonplaces of Luther's early history as they are now understood, we miss the freshness which would have come from a personal contact with, let us say, his voluminous correspondence and that of his contemporaries. The writer is especially careful in dealing with the intricate matter of indulgences, upon which the last word has now perhaps been said, ill understood as the matter was, by Protestants at least, previous to the publication of Mr. Lea's exhaustive work and other recent contributions.

No reader will dispute the wisdom of the editors in permitting Professor A. F. Pollard to write four consecutive chapters upon Germany from the opening of the reign of Charles V to the Peace of Augsburg. These are excellent, suggestive, and coherent, and are a real contribution to the literature in English.

After a rather perfunctory chapter by Mr. A. A. Tilley, sketching the antecedents of the Huguenot wars, the career of Zwingli is clearly described by Rev. J. P. Whitney of Lennoxville, Quebec; and that of Calvin by the well-known writer, Dr. A. M. Fairbairn of Oxford. There is then an interesting and important chapter on the Catholic South by Rev. W. E. Collins of King's College, London. This takes up the spiritual movements among the Romance peoples, a subject much neglected in earlier treatises. In a later chapter the same author describes the course of the Protestant revolt in the Scandinavian North.

Something over a quarter of the volume is devoted to England and the Scotch complications, in four chapters, all by distinguished scholars: "Henry VIII", by James Gairdner; "The Reformation under Edward VI", by Mr. Pollard; "Philip and Mary", by James Bass Mullinger; and "The Anglican Settlement and the Spanish Reformation", by Professor F. W. Maitland. The editors apologize in their preface for devoting so much space to England, but every one will be glad of these excellent chapters.

According to the original programme, Lord Acton himself was to treat the highly important theme of the Council of Trent. As he was prevented from carrying out this plan, the chapter was assigned to Mr. R. V. Laurence of Trinity College, Cambridge, who gives a cogent summary of the development of the Jesuits and of the history of the council.

The volume closes with a chapter perhaps as suggestive as that with which it begins, on the "Tendencies of European Thought in the Age of the Reformation", by Dr. Fairbairn. This is not an attempt, as might be expected, to discover the supposed results of the Protestant revolt, but deals entirely with the religious thought of the period, carefully excluding the political speculation. The writer says:

It is customary to distinguish the Renaissance, as the revival of letters, from the Reformation as the revival of religion. But the distinction is neither formally correct nor materially exact. The Renaissance was

not necessarily secular and classical — it might be, and often was, both religious and Christian; nor was the Reformation essentially religious and moral — it might be and often was political and secular. Of the two revivals the one is indeed in point of time the elder; but the elder is not so much a cause as simply an antecedent of the younger. Both revivals were literary and interpretative, both were imitative and re-creative; but they differed in spirit, and they differed also in province and in results. There was a revival of letters which could not possibly become a reformation of religion, and there was a revival which necessarily involved such a reformation; and the two revivals must be distinguished if the consequences are to be understood (pp. 691-692).

The explanation of the difference Dr. Fairbairn finds in the contrast between the historical antecedents of the Italian and the Teutonic peoples. The chapter is a remarkably successful summary of the general changes in thought in both the north and the south, and will repay careful reading.

On the whole the present volume is quite up to the standard of the first: it has the same virtues and the same defects. The reader will often ask himself whether two or three men might not have done the work better than a dozen. In only two of the chapters, the first and the last, are those results of clarification which come from the highest kind of specialization really clear. Of course it is quite possible for a specialist to fail to give us more than could easily be derived from his own works by any careful epitomizer. This certainly has happened in a number of the chapters, and suggests the inference that it would have been better to have intrusted to writers of well-known capacity the task of covering larger fields, for a coöperative work is always open to the danger of incoherence, repetition, and omission, when the work is so minutely divided as in the series of volumes under consideration.

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON.

Lorenzaccio (Lorenzino de' Medici), 1514-1548. Par PIERRE GAUTHIEZ. (Paris: Albert Fontemoing. 1904. Pp. 476.)

IN view of the fact that the name of Lorenzo recurs with confusing frequency in the annals of the house of Medici, the subject of the present biography requires a word of identification. He is not a direct offspring of the great Lorenzo (il Magnifico), but belongs to the secondary branch, and owes such fame and notoriety as he enjoys chiefly to the circumstance that he murdered his cousin Alexander, first duke of Florence, and was himself murdered in revenge several years later. The murder of Alexander took place in January, 1537, with peculiarly revolting details, mitigated by the circumstance that the victim was, by the unanimous verdict of his contemporaries, a criminal deserving a hundred deaths. As is usual with decadent families, the last Medici are far from being an edifying company, and the political historian is likely to pass them by as unimportant. But the student of civilization is sure to find in them most valuable material, especially if to his interest in the specific quality and appearance

of a generation of men he adds the psychologist's passion for diseased minds and extraordinary personalities. Because he carries such interests as these into his study of the past, M. Gauthiez was qualified to give us the biography of the gifted, debauched, and half-insane young man, who thought that to murder a kinsman sufficed to immortalize himself with Brutus and save the state. The growth of this monstrous illusion, its prevalence among the people of that age, the mental and moral decay among all classes, receive the author's attention, and constitute in their ensemble a discouraging but instructive pendant to the vaunted glories of the Renaissance.

While sketching in this general background with a skilful hand, the author does not forget that his main concern is with the man Lorenzino, whose fortunes and development he tries to present from published records, supplemented by extensive original studies among the Medicean archives. It is impossible to think of a source unused by him from which any additional information is likely to reach us. As the chapters proceed, the lines of the face, together with the lights and shadows of the soul, come out with such clearness that when we arrive at the great crisis of the murder, we have realized the actual Lorenzino and follow him with a perceiving eye. All this is done with genuine Gallic vivacity, and so admirably meets the demand of authentic biography that we can but lament the author's indulgence in fanciful and questionable by-play. To furnish an example: the documents on Lorenzino's youth are very few, but the author masters the difficulty by presenting an ideal picture of boyhood, rescued from triviality only by his thorough knowledge of the time. The tendency is akin to a rather excessive inclination to powerful and even sensational statement. Occasional descriptions suggest the staccato note of the *Figaro* editorial, while a passage like "les enfants avec la subtile cruauté de leurs yeux" — and this is one among a legion — furnish the proof that the author has not been able to escape that preciousness which the study of the Renaissance seems inevitably to engender.

While the charm and vigor of this biography may be due to the author's desire to produce a work of literature rather than of erudition, it cannot be denied that a modicum of the heartily scorned method of historical science would have saved his work from some disfiguring blemishes. Apparently to avoid the accusation of being scholarly, the author takes pains to conceal from the reader his really profound and original information upon his period. Instead of a running accompaniment of foot-notes, absolutely necessary in a work wherein much is new and open to dispute, we have a jumble of references at the end, very inadequately associated with the text. It is plain that the author wished to preserve an unsoiled, literary-looking page. A genealogical table of the house of Medici is indispensable, also a brief sketch of the history of Florence during Lorenzino's span of life. To such accumulation of mere facts the author, whose concern is with a mind and soul flung to and fro between doubt and aspiration, will not descend. It goes without saying,

after these omissions, that we are denied the thinnest thread of an index. If M. Gauthiez had seen fit to graft the historical method upon his biography, he might, without impairing the effectiveness of his art, have produced a book with a much better claim to usefulness and long life.

Like so many members of his house, like so many degenerates of all ages and nations, Lorenzino was a lover of arts and letters. He even commanded a creative vein, and left behind him two productions which are among the literary curios of the sixteenth century, a comedy, *L'Aridosia*, and an autobiographical fragment, the *Apology*. For most readers the frank matter of the *Apology* has a particular charm, and the work is rare enough to merit incorporation in a volume aspiring to present the complete Lorenzino, but with his usual irritating waywardness the author chooses to give us only the much less important *L'Aridosia* in a new translation of his own. However, as *L'Aridosia* is almost inaccessible, whether in the original or in translation, M. Gauthiez compels our gratitude for his offering, especially as the comedy fairly takes rank with the *Mandragola* of Machiavelli, and speaks more eloquently of Lorenzino's talents than a chapter of encomium.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

Histoire de France depuis les Origines jusqu'à la Révolution. Publié sous la Direction de M. ERNEST LAVISSE. Tome V, Partie 2. *La Lutte contre la Maison d'Autriche. La France sous Henri II (1519-1559).* Par HENRY LEMONNIER. Tome VI, Partie 1. *La Réforme et la Ligue. L'Édit de Nantes (1559-1598).* Par JEAN H. MARIÉJOL. (Paris: Hachette et Cie. 1904. Pp. 380, 423.)

PART two of volume five covers the history of the conflict between France and the house of Austria from the accession of Charles V to the peace of Cateau-Cambrésis. It continues the history of French absolutism, of the growth of the French reformation into the Calvinistic system, of the development of the Renaissance into a more formal classicism.

Coinciding in its publication with the recent issue of Bishop Stubbs's lectures, numbers of which treat the same subject in broader outline, the English reader is at once struck with M. Lemonnier's estimate of Charles V. While not so unstinted in praise as that of the late bishop of Oxford, it is yet a clear and penetrating study of the history of the great emperor who too often has been represented by French historians as the gratuitous arch-enemy of France, which Francis I chivalrously sought to defend. English politics, of course, enters largely into the subject, and here M. Lemonnier seems to be unaware of the four articles of Dr. Stephan Ehses published in the *Historisches Jahrbuch* in 1888 and 1892 (IX, 28-48, 209-250, 609-649; XIII, 470-488) and of his collection of *Römische Dokumente* (Paderborn, 1893), which threw new and important light from the Vatican archives upon the divorce of Henry VIII (cf. p. 74). Dr. James Gairdner has directed English attention to the work

of Ehses in the *English Historical Review*, XI, 673-702; XII, 1-16, 237-253; XVII, 572. In the matter of institutional history, in the opinion of the reviewer, the treatment of financial questions under Francis I and Henry II is too brief and too much scattered.

In force of treatment, the latter half of the volume, dealing with the reign of Henry II and French Calvinism, is the better portion. Indeed, it is exceedingly valuable, for, as the author truly observes, there is no adequate history of the reign of Henry II; much of the documentary material yet remains unclassified. As might be expected from one whose specialty is the history of sixteenth-century art and letters, books XI and XII, dealing with the formation of the classic spirit in France, are particularly full and complete.

It is a rather sharp transition from the fifth to the sixth volume; for in both scope and policy there is a difference. Part one of the sixth volume, *La Réforme et la Ligue: l'Édit de Nantes (1559-1598)*, differs from preceding volumes of the series in that it limits the field to political and institutional history only. Unfortunately one feels in reading it that the task of writing the history of this critical period has been assigned to the wrong person. It was a principle of the common law that a child should not be given into the care of a nurse who loved it not. This principle has a certain applicability in the present case. The brilliant work already done in the field of the French Reformation by M. Henri Hauser of the University of Dijon, who in 1894 and again in 1897 lectured at the Sorbonne (cf. an article by him in the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* for January, 1899, IV, 217-227: "The French Reformation and the French People in the Sixteenth Century") would seem to have pointed him out as the most capable person to write the volume pertaining to this period.

There is no lack of scholarship on M. Mariéjol's part, for the text bears many evidences of original research (*e. g.*, p. 56, where the K-collection of the Archives Nationales has very plainly been examined). The deficiency is a certain failure to appreciate the double nature of the struggle, a real disinclination, apparently, to look at both sides of the issue. The author assumes from the beginning that the Huguenot party was largely in the wrong and gratuitously made strife for the sake of self-advantage. The reiteration of this idea at last becomes irritating. It is a disparagement of the Huguenot party to say that it was wholly actuated by "le ressentiment d'une injure ou l'amour du changement" (p. 12). What is one to think of the statements that "En réalité, ils [les protestants] n'avaient d'autre excuse que l'intérêt religieux" (p. 69); that Coligny was playing a deep and daring game (p. 119); and that "as friend or as enemy he was equally to be feared" (p. 124)?

M. Mariéjol seems to think the distinction between the Huguenots of religion and the Huguenots of state to have been a suspicious and a specious one, and yet the distinction was fully admitted from the inception of the civil wars (Pierre de la Place, *Commentaires de l'état de la religion et de la république*, 41; Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes, *Mémoires*, 241).

The issue raised by the former imperceptibly merged into that of the political Huguenots, who not only wanted to alter the foundations of belief but to change the institutional order of things, and who used religious opposition as a means to attack the authority of the crown. If the cause of religion was an issue, that of the state was as much so, and the two conjoined provoked a long series of civil wars. It is to be regretted that this depreciatory treatment of the Huguenot cause should prevail throughout the book, for it vitiates what otherwise is, in the main, a comprehensive survey of the history of France during the civil wars. From the inception of the Holy League in 1576, the residue of the volume (books III and IV) is an adequate account.

Exception may be taken to a number of statements which are errors of fact. On p. 8 it is said that Catherine de Médicis was the person who sent Anthony of Navarre off to Spain in the abortive hope of recovering his lost kingdom. On the contrary, the evidence is in favor of the part of the Guises in this move. With the conceit of a weak man in a prominent position, Anthony entertained schemes of his own at this time. His purpose was to play Spain and England against one another, in the hope that he might persuade Philip II to restore to him the kingdom of Navarre by a firm advocacy of Catholicism in France (which of course prevented him from affiliating with the Huguenot party to which Condé and the Châtillons were attached) or, in the event of failure in this, to side with the Huguenots and enlist English support. Shortly after his arrival at the court from Béarn, on August 23, 1559, he made overtures to Throckmorton, the English ambassador in France. After a long declaration of his affection for Elizabeth, he said that he would write to her with his own hand, for if either the Guises or the Spanish ambassador knew of it, "it would be dangerous for both and hinder their good enterprise" (August 25, 1559, *Calendar of State Papers, Elizabeth, Foreign*, I, 498). But the Guises were made aware of Navarre's doings through the treachery of a gentleman of his suite, and shrewdly schemed to rid themselves of his presence by sending him to Spain as escort for Elizabeth of France (Régner de la Planche, *Histoire de l'état de France sous François II*, I, 212-216; Gaspard de Saulx-Tavannes, 246).

The feud between the constable and the Guises over Dammartin is said (p. 9) to have grown out of the revocation by Francis II of the alienations of the royal domain made by his father, and to have begun in October, 1559. Now the Tuscan ambassador, than whom no diplomat in Paris was better informed, first makes mention of it in April, 1560. Moreover, the feud did not have relation to the king's ordinance. The duke of Guise had purchased the right of the sieur de Rambures to the county of Dammartin, not far from Paris and adjacent to that of Nanteuil, which the duke had shortly before acquired, the lower court of which was held in relief of Dammartin. In order to do so, Guise had persuaded Philippe de Boulainvilliers, who had lately sold the property to the constable, to rescind the contract which had been made and to sell it to him

(la Place, 38). But the duke met with a straight rebuff, for when he sent word of the transaction the constable answered by Damville, his son, that "as he had bought it, so would he keep it". The account of the pursuit of the Huguenots after the failure of the conspiracy of Amboise (pp. 16-18) fails to include mention of the important fact that *lettres de cachet* were issued *in blank* to the marshals and other officers, the instructions of the king being a curious monument of the fury of the Guises (*Correspondance de l'Aubespine*, 342-343). Montmorency (p. 14) is acquitted of a knowledge of the conspiracy of Amboise on his own evidence, which was so vigorously given before the parliament after the collapse of the conspiracy (cf. la Place, 37; Michel de Castelnau, *Mémoires*, bk. II, ch. 11). But, protestation aside, there is little room to doubt at least the constable's knowledge of the affair. The conspirators were in the main recruited from the Breton border, Anjou, Poitou, and Saintonge, with individual captains from Normandy, Picardy, Provence, and Languedoc. The rendezvous was at Nantes. In the early winter Montmorency had visited his lands in Poitou, Angoumois, and Buttay, having quitted his usual place of residence at Chantilly and traveled in those quarters of France which are identical with those wherein the conspiracy of Amboise was hatched (la Place, 32; la Planche, 279). Is it reasonable to believe that a man of his political acumen and state of feeling toward the Guises at the time could have been unaware of at least a portion of what was in preparation?

As has been invariably the case, the bibliographies attached to the various chapters are full and discriminating.

JAMES WESTFALL THOMPSON.

Queen Elizabeth and the Levant Company: a Diplomatic and Literary Episode of the Establishment of our Trade with Turkey. By the Rev. H. G. ROSEDALE, M.A., D.D., F.R.S.L., Vicar of St. Peter's, Bayswater. (London and New York: Henry Frowde. 1904. Pp. xii, 91).

THE history of Anglo-Turkish relations still lacks an historian; and the affairs of the Levant or Turkey Company have not as yet received the careful study they deserve. This book, a folio published under the direction of the Royal Society of Literature, is a beautiful specimen of the printer's art and contains twenty-six plates, reproductions of rare engravings, and photographs of pages of manuscript documents; but it does not pretend to illuminate the history of English relations with the Porte, except within a most limited area and in respect to matters of no wide significance. The larger part of the volume consists of documents, at least two of which have already been printed, though the fact is not indicated. The thread of editorial explanation is slight in character and does not on the whole show a very keen appreciation of aught save antiquarian interests. Such statements as that the Janissaries are the "hereditary soldiers of Turkey" are open to comment; and the omission of

explanatory facts, easily obtainable from the *Calendar of State Papers, Venetian*, IX (1592-1603), is a cause of regret. The author likewise forgets the ventures of English merchants in the Levant early in the sixteenth century when he states (p. 41), "In the year 1595 our trade with Turkey had only been in existence about 15 years."

The argument of the work is briefly as follows: Toward the close of the reign of Murad III the Levant Company had made handsome presents to the court at Constantinople. The death of the sultan in 1595 and the accession of his son Muhammad III made it advisable for the English to win favor once more by suitable gifts to the new ruler. Fearful lest the sober merchants of London might rebel at the thought of new presents, the English ambassador at Constantinople, Sir Edward Barton, arranged that an account of the accession to power of the new sultan should reach Queen Elizabeth's eyes in a form most interesting and designed to satisfy her curiosity, while it presented the new ruler in a more favorable light than the facts warranted; all this to the end that the queen might be persuaded to undertake herself the cost of the new gifts. After a considerable delay, the result was the despatch from England of Master Thomas Dallam with an organ for the sultan. Some light is shed thereby on the intricacies of Elizabethan diplomacy as well as on the conditions which governed European intercourse with the Ottoman empire at the close of the sixteenth century. It is unfair to blame the author for not doing what he never intended to do, and yet we must regret that the time and labor evidently involved should not have been productive of larger and more valuable results.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

The Policy and Administration of the Dutch in Java. By CLIVE DAY, PH.D. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. xxi, 434.)

THIS excellent work, based upon a wide and critical study of the Dutch literature on the subject as well as of the original sources, presents an account of the development and present character of the economic administration in Dutch India. The book is specially welcome, because the literature in English on the colonial history and methods of the Dutch is very meager and in large part unreliable. The author gives a clear and safe account of the history of Java under the company. He points out very forcibly that the regard for native institutions for which the Dutch have received so much credit was due originally not to any consideration for the natives, but to a desire for a complete and rapid exploitation of the colony with their aid. Thus the tendency to develop communal holdings of land was encouraged because this form of ownership offered few difficulties in administration. In this process, however, many native institutions, though avowedly maintained, were seriously distorted from their original character; and the system of the company, which used the natives as taskmasters to supply its demands, was strik-

ingly like that employed to-day by the Congo Free State. The author discusses the important charter of 1803, the reactionary government of Daendels, and the brief but permanently important administration of Raffles, who introduced the land-tax with the purpose of abolishing forced labor. The historical development leading up to the culture system is carefully and clearly traced; the latter is shown to be a continuation and adaptation of the policy in use under the company; the real cause of its introduction was the financial need of the Dutch government, notwithstanding the ardent professions made by van den Bosch. Throughout his discussion the author expresses a very unfavorable opinion of the culture system, as well with regard to its effect upon the natives as to its general economic efficiency. Although it yielded rich returns to the Dutch treasury, these were gained almost entirely from the culture of coffee and sugar and were due to the high prices of these products and to the excessive burden placed upon the native laborers. In the opinion of the author the system was economically inefficient, as it demanded an undue amount of forced labor and did not permanently increase the economic ability of the natives. The author totally repudiates the opinions expressed by Money, and he demonstrates that Money's book, *Java: or, How to Manage a Colony* (London, 2 vols., 1861), hitherto considered the principal source of information on the Dutch system, is totally unreliable in its facts. The gradual abolition of the culture system and the present economic régime are discussed in the last chapters. The author confines himself, however, to the land and labor questions and the fiscal policy. It is to be hoped that he may continue to work in the rich field which he has opened up and to deal in his thorough and luminous fashion with such matters as the currency, law and the judiciary, and irrigation, and to present to the American people some insight into the admirable scientific work of the Javanese government and of the fruitful study of native institutions by Dr. Christiaan Snouck Hurgronje, the famous advisor on native affairs. While the author has done much to destroy the current admiration for the culture system, he also bears witness to the intelligence and thoroughness with which the Dutch colonial government is at present approaching the many difficult problems of colonial administration.

P. S. REINSCH.

The Philippine Islands, 1493-1898. Edited by EMMA HELEN BLAIR and JAMES A. ROBERTSON. Vol. XVI, 1609. Vol. XVII, 1609-1616. Vol. XVIII, 1617-1620. (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company. 1904. Pp. 329, 336, 346.)

THE four volumes XII to XVI of this series of translations of Philippine historical documents have been given up mainly to reproductions in English of Spanish works of the beginning of the seventeenth century which are standard sources of authority on early Philippine history under Spain, and to a considerable extent also on the customs and conditions

of the Philippine peoples at the time of the conquest. In volume XVI the work of Antonio de Morga (*Sucesos de las Islas Filipinas*, Mexico, 1609), generally conceded to be the most important of all the early sources, is completed in its second English translation (the first being that of Lord Stanley, published by the Hakluyt Society in 1868). One hundred forty pages are required for its final chapter, dealing with the customs of the natives. Morga asserts (p. 117) that there were "very few" who did not write their dialects in the alphabet they possessed at the coming of the Spaniards. Morga's history of the years 1565-1606, especially for the last ten of those, when he was judge and, part of the time, executive in the islands, and when he collected many of the documents which he cites, is of itself of great value. His treatise on the natives is the most complete we have, and, along with the relations of Loarca, Plasencia, and Chirino (which have all been reproduced in this series) and some of the early missionary letters less formal in treatment (notably the letters of Jesuit fathers, some of them first brought to light in this series), it forms our only contemporary source of information as to the primitive Filipinos. Morga's statements about the natives negative many of the exaggerated assertions made in recent years about their savagery at the time of discovery, and his work was drawn into the very midst of the modern Spanish-Filipino political controversy when José Rizal published his edition of 1890, with annotations semi-scientific and semi-political. Efforts have been made by Spanish reactionaries to impugn Morga's authority as an observer and historian, and his character as well; but his work bears its own internal evidence of the writer's possession, in a remarkable degree for his times, of the "scientific spirit".

The translation, the facsimiles of title-pages, etc., and the annotations (drawn from both the Rizal and Stanley editions and supplemented to some extent) make this on the whole a more satisfactory English edition of Morga than that of the Hakluyt Society. One hundred ten pages of volume XVI are also given to translated abstracts of sections bearing on the Philippines from B. L. de Argensola's *Conquista de las Islas Malucas* (Madrid, 1609), a work that is classic for Spanish style, but not as a history. The work of selection, synopsis, and translation has been well done by Mr. Robertson. The title-page and a picture of the "caracoa" of those times are reproduced. To complete a very interesting volume, and falling in well with Morga's treatise, we have a brief account of the customs of the natives of Pampanga in their lawsuits, discovered in the Seville archives during the search for material for this series, and on very creditable grounds ascribed by the editors to Father Plasencia, author of the more extended relation of 1589. These documents will be studied most profitably in connection with accurate research into the customs of the Moros and other peoples following their primitive customs in the Philippines to-day.

Volumes XVII and XVIII together contain nearly forty documents, dealing with the state of missions, the efforts at the conquest of souls and trade in Japan, the struggles to retain conquest in the Moluccas, the

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. X.—26.

rivalry with the Portuguese there and in China, overshadowed for the time by the danger from the Dutch, and also, as something never to be dispensed with at any stage of Spanish-Philippine history, the personal jealousies and dissensions over policy of the Spanish officials in the islands, especially of the civil with the ecclesiastical authorities. There stand out above all other things of the time, first, the harassments of the Dutch, who, outside of the immediate neighborhood of the Spanish posts at Manila and in the Bisayas and the island of Ternate, were having the seas of the far east very much to themselves, with occasional reverses to be sure, but frequently putting the Spaniards on the defensive even in the areas mentioned; and, second, the burdens laid upon the Philippine natives to sustain the pretensions of the crown of Spain against these vigorous enemies, and, as if the demands for ship-building, the manning of ships, etc., were not enough, the abuses which were gratuitously heaped upon these Oriental subjects by Spaniards both of sword and habit.

The documents of these two volumes are well selected and well grouped to enable the reader to discern the currents of the times and form his own judgments upon the old rival claims which still play a part in Philippine controversy. The editors have translated some of the laws of the Indies, and given references to various others, bearing on Philippine trade and commerce and on the treatment of the natives. The law of May 26, 1609, regarding personal service by the Philippine natives was taken from book VI of the *Laws of the Indies*, and is law XL of title XII therein, which title is entirely devoted to the subject of the treatment of the natives; it might well have been accompanied by a summary of all these provisions, in fact of the decrees regarding personal service, etc., from the time of Charles V, and especially by a reference to some of the other significant decrees intended to apply directly to the Philippines. The early decrees on this subject, and to a considerable extent also the later, were designed primarily to meet conditions in the American colonies of Spain. The fact that their provisions were constantly repeated during two centuries shows that they are an indication of the abuses that existed rather than a sign of good treatment of the Indians; such a law as that of 1609 (no. XLVIII of the above title), wherein Philip III declares that his previous injunctions regarding the treatment of the Indians must be held as still in force, even if some have supposed not, sheds a flood of light upon the actual Spanish administration in the colonies. One might expect a reference in this same volume to law XLIII (March 17, 1608), of the same title, forbidding in detail certain abuses of the natives by the missionary priests; but matters of this sort are brought out in the document on "Reforms Needed in the Filipinas", presented to the Council of the Indies in 1620 by an ecclesiastic, and reproduced in part in volume XVIII (to be concluded in XIX). All classes of Spaniards shared in the blame this critic distributed.

The editors are to be commended also for the useful list of governors of the Philippine Islands at the end of volume XVII. It is probably the

most correct and complete list of the sort available. There are some omissions, however, from the brief summaries of important events occurring under each administration, and one detects in the notes on the governors of the last twenty years some gossip from the book of the Englishman Sawyer, which may well be true, yet is not proved, and is in questionable taste. The abstracts from Sinibaldo de Mas, *Informe sobre el estado de las Islas Filipinas en 1842* (Madrid, 1843) and from Montero y Vidal's of 1886 (not 1866, as given on p. 329) give a very fair idea of the administrative machinery of the Philippines up to, say, 1868 and the revolution in Spain; but there was much making and remaking of Philippine governmental machinery, especially by various Liberal administrations, after that date. The outline of Philippine government as here presented needs supplementing, therefore, by some such abstract as that given of the Spanish administration in the *Report of the Philippine Commission*, 1900, volume I, which in turn was defective precisely in its failure to note that many of the features of government which it outlined were most recent innovations.

Other documents in these two volumes deserving particular mention are the letters of the Jesuit fathers, the letters between the king and governors Silva and Fajardo de Tenza, the anonymous "Description of the Philippine Islands" of 1618, and a letter on ship-building in the islands at that time. The work of the editors has, as indicated, shown steady improvement. The translating staff—and, for such a work as this, translation is all-important—is, as nearly as one may judge without having the original texts for comparison, doing more effective work than at the beginning.

It is highly regrettable to record that a work having the importance which has this, and having such special significance at this time, should up to date have received most unsatisfactory support in the United States, even from libraries. The publishers originally limited the edition to one thousand numbered sets. They now announce that, beginning with February, 1905, the number of each volume issued will be strictly limited to the number of subscribers, and that the excess of the twenty-two volumes issued up to that time will be destroyed, a feature which should receive the attention of libraries and private collectors.

JAMES A. LE ROY.

George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham, 1628–1687: a Study in the History of the Restoration. By WINIFRED, LADY BURGHCLERE. (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company; London: John Murray. 1903. Pp. ix, 414.)

THE biographies of Restoration worthies have been increased by the life of one whose talents would win him that place were they not neutralized by a character which made him a puzzle to his contemporaries as well as to later generations. Indeed the life of the second Villiers who bore the ill-fated title of Buckingham is no less a study in psychology

than in politics. "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel" might well be taken as the motto of this biography of him who was so various that he seemed to be not one but all mankind's epitome. As courtier or demagogue, rake or devotee, a man of infinite talent and infinite whim, he was at once a perpetual interest if to some a perpetual irritation while alive, and his biography offers an equal puzzle though unmixed with irritation to us who do not suffer from his vagaries. Lady Burghclere has written a charming and useful book on a most perplexing subject. A consistent clue to the mystery of Buckingham's erratic career she has not professed to find, but has painted the portrait of him who was everything by turns and nothing long, and has set him forth fairly and without prejudice. It is an appreciation rather than an apology or criticism, and is as free from controversy as such a book may well be. The truth is that the only real clue to such a character as that of Buckingham is that where most men follow their reason, interest, or conscience in the affairs of life, he followed his fancy. This made his life one long inconsistency, and makes a convincing biography a most difficult task. That the attempt was worth while, the success of the result proves. Much new material is here utilized, and much new proof, though no very startling new conclusions are adduced. The account of parties and the duke's connection with them, and in particular his relations with the men of his day, Clarendon, Shaftesbury, and above all the king, are admirably expressed. This last alone would make the book valuable, even were it not for the numerous side-lights thrown on many transactions of court and politics. Nothing gives one a better opinion of the book than the careful handling of the French evidence in it, whether the *chronique scandaleuse* of Grammont or the often little less imaginative despatches of the ambassadors. Yet when all is said of the historical merits of the book, it is the personality of Buckingham drawn in these pages which remains in mind. Of this there is perhaps no better nor more characteristic illustration than the explanation of the success of that amazing metamorphosis which turned the prince of courtiers into the chief of demagogues. The reasons given (pp. 288-289) are worth quoting in full, as, at least, an ingenious speculation:

Hitherto also, in dealing with the worthy country members or even with the politicians of the Cabal, he had committed an initial blunder. He had so profoundly assimilated the maxims and methods of gallantry that unconsciously he brought something of the atmosphere of the boudoir with him to the Council Board. It was an error. His posturing, his sensationalism, merely alienated the matter-of-fact British legislator. In dealing with the mob, however, it was far otherwise. The feminine element, which underlies its fierce and varying moods, wrought them instantly to a high pitch of sympathy and mutual understanding. All the passion he had brought to the worship of his perverse mistress he now lavished on the wooing of the multitude, till at last he reaped the signal glory of seeing London ablaze with bonfires in his honour, and every street and alley resounding to the cry of "A Buckingham! a Buckingham!"

The amazing vicissitudes and complexities of Buckingham's career are worked out with every care as to authority, and the book is therefore scholarly as well as readable. The index is good, the illustrations excellent, and the form, paper, and typography admirable.

W. C. ABBOTT.

La Guerre de Sept Ans: Histoire Diplomatique et Militaire. Par RICHARD WADDINGTON. Tome II. Crefeld et Zorndorf. Tome III. Minden, Kunersdorf, Québec. (Paris: Firmin-Didot et Cie. [1904.] Pp. iii, 488; 549.)

THESE volumes continue the detailed narrative of which the first volume, *Les Débuts*, was published by M. Waddington in 1899; it is here brought down through the events of the years 1758 and 1759. This is a period of much greater military than political interest; its unimportance in the latter respect is the more striking by contrast with the opening period of the war. There is therefore little or no reflection here of the bitter controversies as to that opening period that were raging when M. Waddington began this work, and to which perhaps we owe the undertaking. Those who are interested in this field will remember that M. Waddington is the foremost French representative of the new school of investigators of this epoch that sprang into activity with the publication of the *Politische Correspondenz* of Frederick II, and that he is an adherent of the older German views represented by Koser and Naudé as against the new positions of Lehmann and Delbrück. It is perhaps not always easy to see the differences of position between M. Waddington and M. de Broglie, his most important French forerunner in this field; but there can be no question that the present writer has the advantage of much more complete information and that he is making full use of his opportunities. The merits of the work and its elaborateness are already sufficiently manifest to make it safe to predict that it will preempt this field for many years to come. M. Waddington has a clear and pleasing style and handles his vast material with ease and effect. The maps with which the volumes are provided are doubtless good, but they are not very conveniently placed, and the military reader will probably regret the entire absence of plans.

The present reviewer must confess that he is not a military reader, and that, in spite of the manifest merits of this work, he has been visited during its superficial examination with serious misgivings. The 1,037 pages of the present volumes are overwhelmingly devoted to military movements, and the minor diplomatic narrative seems the more unimportant because the wordy parleying for the most part comes to nothing. Yet this detailed following of the clash of arms must be intended mainly for the non-professional reader; it can hardly be supposed that the professional military student of the Seven Years' War will rest with any civilian narrative; if so, it seems too elaborate a rehashing of campaigns so often dealt with already. No new conclusions of importance seem

to be reached ; and the thousand pages are not apportioned with the strictest regard to the permanent importance of the events. Those relatively unimportant operations in western Germany in which the French were engaged (for the most part very ingloriously) are given more space than the far greater encounters of Frederick with his dearest foes ; while the immortal campaign that gave North America irretrievably to the Anglo-Saxon is given no more space than the almost unknown campaign of Crefeld. Apart from this the narrative seems scrupulously fair, being animated indeed by what may be called the conventional French indulgent attitude toward Frederick and unsparing condemnation of the government and person of Louis XV. The reviewer in objecting to the great detail of the work has in mind that this great length is due mainly to the fact that the author incorporates with the text large extracts from the sources, his foot-notes being used purely for references. This method can scarcely be commended ; one of the natural and inalienable rights of the reader is surely that of skipping the corroborating foot-note.

VICTOR COFFIN.

The Fight for Canada : a Naval and Military Sketch from the History of the Great Imperial War. By WILLIAM WOOD. (Westminster : Archibald Constable and Company. 1904. Pp. xxi, 363.)

THE story of the struggle between Britain and her colonies and the French people for the mastery on the American continent maintains its interest to the present day, notwithstanding the many great and important events which followed it. As Parkman studied the fascinating theme, "day and night", it grew with him into an integral portion of the war against the dominance of France under Louis XV which covered Europe and only terminated with the complete exhaustion of the lands which formed the battle-fields of the contending parties. Earl Stanhope, Carlyle, Warburton, and still later A. G. Bradley, have treated it from the same standpoint. Mr. Wood is a citizen of Quebec proud of its historic fame, and is a collaborator of Mr. A. G. Doughty in the collection and publication of the manuscripts and pamphlets on the siege of Quebec, which has recently been issued in six volumes. As a result of his investigation he has become deeply interested in the operations which immediately preceded the Battle of the Plains and led to the surrender of Quebec. He has consequently confined himself to this one incident, and that the final one, in a series of campaigns which lasted for over four years. The title of the book therefore is somewhat misleading.

One of the principal ideas of the author is to emphasize the position which Captain Mahan has developed in his *Influence of Sea Power upon History*, that the campaign against Quebec should be treated as a naval operation and that this was only possible when the sovereignty of the seas had been gained. Wolfe's army, which numbered only one-half of the marine force, is treated as a landing party of veteran soldiers, who,

once able to meet Montcalm's composite army in the open plain, were sure of success. The conquest of Louisburg and the failure of the French ships to throw supplies into Quebec showed how completely the French navy had been demoralized, and it was nearly a quarter of a century before they recovered their position under Suffren and de Grasse: so in some respects Mr. Wood's point of view is not amiss. On the other hand, the whole of the operations against Canada had for their center Quebec, and by compelling Montcalm to guard the upper St. Lawrence they deprived him of some of his best men. If Lévis and the troops under his command could have been recalled to Quebec, the result of Wolfe's landing might have been very different. In leading up to the actual battle, Mr. Wood has devoted considerable space to the characters of Vaudreuil and Bigot, upon whom he is very severe, and to Anson, Saunders, Montcalm, and Wolfe, who are the heroes of that day. It is difficult at first to see the reason for the introduction of Anson's name, until we learn (p. 82) that "at the head of the Admiralty [he] made the Navy the greatest fighting force on either land or sea". It is however the detailed account of the action which reveals his local and military knowledge and makes his description of the hourly occurrences as vivid as if they had taken place yesterday.

A comparison is forced upon the reader with Mr. Parkman's brilliant chapters, which form a climax in which he has skilfully so elaborated the manuscript and printed authorities as to convey the epic character of the struggle. Mr. Wood has not Mr. Parkman's command of resonant prose, but in simple language details the events hour by hour, describing the character of the ground as one familiar with every foot of it, and the movements of the men on each side as if at a review. He declines to accept the current story of Wolfe and the "Elegy in a Country Churchyard", on the ground that the evidence is insufficient. The principal authority for it appears to be John Robison (1739-1805), who at the time was acting as tutor to the son of one of the admirals and was rated as a midshipman. During the siege he was employed in assisting the scientific officers in surveying. In after years he became famous as a mathematician and was appointed professor of natural philosophy in the University of Edinburgh (*Dictionary of National Biography*). In 1830 Sir Walter Scott, writing to Southey, says he had heard Robison tell his story that on the night before battle Robison, being in the same boat with the general, heard the latter read or recite the "Elegy" and say to the officers about him that, if he had the choice, he "would rather be the author of these verses than win the battle which we are to fight to-morrow morning".¹ Professor Playfair, Robison's successor, also repeats the story, as having received it at first hand, in the biographical sketch of his colleague (*Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 1815, VII, 495-539). These two witnesses are corroborated by numerous incidental allusions to what appears to have been a well-known Edinburgh story, and

¹ September 22, 1830, printed by Mr. Augustine Birrell in *The Times Literary Supplement*, May 27, 1904, p. 165. See also the *Athenæum*, July 9, 1904, p. 49.

the evidence seems conclusive as to its authenticity. The improbability of Wolfe's reciting a poem, when absolute silence was required, is due perhaps to Lord Stanhope's transferring it from the early evening to the hour of attack next morning, in which he has been followed by Carlyle, Parkman, and others. Professor E. E. Morris, however, has taken the opposite view in the *English Historical Review* (XV, 125-129, January, 1900).

Mr. Wood should not have permitted Bradstreet's name to appear repeatedly as "Broadstreet" nor Robison as "Robinson". The contemporary map, which appeared for the first time in Mr. Doughty's collection, 1901, is a valuable addition to the book.

JAMES BAIN.

Josiah Tucker, Economist: a Study in the History of Economics.

By WALTER ERNEST CLARK, Ph.D., Instructor in the College of the City of New York. [Studies in History, Economics and Public Law, Vol. XIX, No. 1.] (New York: Columbia University Press; The Macmillan Company; London: P. S. King and Son. 1903. Pp. 258.)

JOSIAH TUCKER (1713-1799), Dean of Gloucester, has received in the past but scant treatment at the hands of economic historians. His acuteness of intellect and the boldness and general soundness of his views have been recognized, but he has been set down as a pamphleteer who discussed questions of the hour and said little of enduring value. Dr. Clark has in this monograph given us the first satisfactory presentation of Tucker's surroundings, life, and work. He has had access to all his writings, including two very rare folios, never publicly printed: *The Elements of Commerce and Theory of Taxes* (1755), and *Instructions for Travellers* (1757).¹ These two essays, probably unknown to economists until well into the nineteenth century, contain his only systematic attempt to construct a science of economics. Had they come to light when written, they might have given their author a more important place among the predecessors of Adam Smith.

Tucker was a vigorous advocate of an increased population for Great Britain. He observed with regret the emigration to America, urged a tax on bachelors and exemptions for married men, and favored free immigration. He denounced monopoly in all its forms, the exclusive trading-companies, the artisans under the protection of the Elizabethan apprenticeship law, the British ship-owners and sailors under the Navigation Act, and the combinations of factory laborers. On no other topic did he write so voluminously. He preferred the domestic to the factory system of industry for its effect on labor and product, advocated piece-wages, but argued for a low rate of wages to increase England's competitive strength. His views on population and wages indicate Tucker's mer-

¹ In addition to the three copies of this work located by Dr. Clark, there is one in the Library of Congress. Ed.

cantilist sympathies, yet he occupies an intermediate position between the rigid exclusiveness of mercantilism and the freedom of trade of Adam Smith. He disposed of the fallacy that one nation could thrive only at the expense of another and condemned "going to war for the sake of getting trade" (p. 170). There is "something ridiculous", he said, "in the farce that a shopkeeper should bully his customers to compel them to deal with him against their interests" (p. 173), a good answer to the fallacy that trade follows the flag. He avoided the error of identifying national riches with money metal and opposed prohibitions on metal export. But he favored duties upon the import of foreign manufactures and upon the export of raw materials, and advocated bounties and premiums as encouragements to industry while in the infant stage. "Attempts ought to be made to wean this commercial child by gentle degrees" (p. 183).

His hostility to distant colonies had an economic motive. Colonies were costly, they added nothing to the trade advantages of the mother-country, they drew population from home, and they sought independence as soon as it was to their economic interest to do so. As early as 1749 he asserted that the American colonies would seek independence as soon as they no longer needed Great Britain's assistance. Tucker will be remembered by students of American history as one of the few men in England who consistently wrote and preached American independence, and who scouted the idea that the separation of the colonies would spell the ruin of England.

The fact that all of Tucker's published writings were of a controversial nature on current questions, and that his more extended and systematic work was never published, would explain the slight influence which this writer has exercised upon the development of economic thought. Dr. Clark insists, however, upon crediting Tucker with a considerable indirect influence upon the development of British economics in paving the way for the *Wealth of Nations*, and declares that he deserves a greater recognition than he has as yet received. By his thorough and scholarly monograph the author has done much to give Tucker this recognition. A complete and excellent bibliography of Tucker's writings is added.

FRANK HAIGH DIXON.

The Administration of the American Revolutionary Army. By LOUIS CLINTON HATCH. [Harvard Historical Studies, X.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. viii, 229.)

THE effect of the democratic principle when applied to the administration of an army is rather ruthlessly shown in this monograph. The weakness of Congress, too, as a central government is clearly demonstrated in this close study of one of its most important functions. Until the ratification of the Articles of Confederation in 1781, Mr. Hatch shows, any state, and even any individual who was not in the actual

service of Congress, could refuse obedience to its commands, on the ground that it was unable to show any right to issue them. Even in the formation of the army, where Congress might assume the greatest power, it acted mainly through the state governments. So jealously did the state representatives in Congress keep the power in their own hands that, though a War Department was needed, the representatives in Congress at first administered military affairs themselves, frequently allowing even their committees only the authority to report, not to act. A war office became imperative, however, and in the summer of 1776 a Board of War and Ordnance was devised, and in 1777 a new board, not members of Congress, was appointed. In 1781 General Lincoln was made Secretary of War, thus securing the advantage of a single-headed department.

After accounting for the evolution of the Continental army and discussing the relations between Congress and the commander-in-chief, Mr. Hatch has contributed a valuable chapter on the subject of the "Appointment and Promotion" of officers, showing the jealousy of the members of Congress for the rights of their states. The several colonies wished not only to furnish officers for their troops, but also to make appointments for all ranks below that of brigadier-general. Washington was greatly hampered by the state jealousies. In the matter of a certain promotion, he wrote to Sullivan, "If in all cases ours was *one* army, or *thirteen* armies allied for common defence, there would be no difficulty in solving your question; but we are occasionally both, and . . . sometimes *neither*, but a compound of *both*" (p. 45).

The chapter on "Foreign Officers" is the least valuable in the volume, adding little to the account in Tower's *Lafayette* and that in Wharton's *Diplomatic Correspondence*. The following chapter, on "Pay and Half-Pay", is, on the other hand, a real contribution, treating clearly the subject of bounties, the real as compared with the apparent pay of the soldier, the inequalities of pay, which provoked so great discontent, and finally the long struggle in Congress over half-pay and the resolution to grant half-pay for seven years. To the assertion of Congress that the American soldiers received pay "greater than ever soldiers had", there is a commentary that the soldiers of New England were not, as in Europe, the wanderers of the city streets or half-starved peasants, but were frequently landowners or the sons of landowners who lived in a sort of rude comfort, and who could not see in poor food and six and two-thirds dollars a month a proper compensation for the camp dangers and hardships. The next chapter deals with the difficult question of "Supplying the Army", the mismanagement in the feeding and clothing of the army, and the consequent suffering at Valley Forge. It is, on the whole, the most accurate account we have, and is stated with moderation and without sentimentality. The mutinies of 1781 are well treated without, however, adding anything to our previous knowledge, or putting a new interpretation upon the events discussed.

The "Newburg Addresses" in the following chapter are, however, treated in a fuller and more conclusive manner. Mr. Hatch points out

that the long war and the intercourse with the French army had resulted in a diminution of pride in "Spartan simplicity", and an increased sensitiveness at being compelled to live in a manner unbecoming "an officer and a gentleman". Not only were there temporary discomforts, but there was anxiety for the future. The war would soon end, leaving them without money, credit, or business connections, but with themselves and families to support. Congress had been asked for half-pay, but the New England delegates were opposed, and, since no appropriation could pass Congress without the assent of nine states, it was doubtful whether the measure would succeed. As a result of this condition appeared the anonymous Newburg addresses urging the officers to compel Congress to do them justice. Mr. Hatch thinks that on the whole we may dismiss as unlikely Judge Johnson's theory of a plot of the officers to establish monarchy. More likely many of the officers hoped to compel Congress to retain them in service permanently. As to the civilian members of the conspiracy, it is held that they cared little for the claims of the officers, but desired political reform, hoping that the fear of military revolt would induce the states to increase the powers of Congress, or that Congress, with the support of the army, might assume additional powers itself. Gouverneur Morris was most seriously implicated in this plot, as his own correspondence shows.

The last chapter treats the "Mutiny of 1783 and Disbandment of the Army". The book closes with the general comment that the administration of the Revolutionary army is not one in which an American can take pride. "The people were often indifferent, the officers captious and quarrelsome, and Congress inefficient and negligent" (p. 196). Yet an excuse is offered for each, and Mr. Hatch urges that, though we may note their errors, we must not forget their sufferings and their achievements. The book is well organized and well written. It is a source study of high merit, and is well worthy its place among the Harvard Historical Studies. There is a valuable bibliography and a good index.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late LORD ACTON, LL.D. Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., and STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Vol. VIII. *The French Revolution.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1904. Pp. xxvii, 875).

THE reviews of volumes I and VII of the *Cambridge Modern History*, which have appeared in the *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW* (IX, 142-147, 365-369), have determined the canons of judgment which must hold in respect to the fashion of coöperative historical production exhibited in this series of twelve volumes. The respective tasks of editors, contributors, and even of reviewers have been well defined; and in view of what has already been written it appears unnecessary on this

occasion to enter into any further general discussion regarding these matters. Even with the aid of this process of elimination, much more remains for consideration than the limits of this review will permit. It is therefore possible to write only of the scope and relative value of the various divisions of the work and of the character and merits of the book as a whole. Details must as a rule be neglected. The technical appearance of the book is of course good, and the bibliographies and index will prove useful.

The editors have succeeded in their plan of fixing the main attention of the reader on Paris, though the foreign policy of Pitt (1783-1793), the successive partitions of Poland, and European opinion concerning the Revolution receive more or less adequate recognition. Whether this scheme is open to criticism or not, the volume unquestionably gains thereby in unity of theme. The twenty-five chapters are by thirteen writers, a proportion which, as compared with the other volumes, shows a steady decrease in the number of different contributors. *The Renaissance* contained nineteen chapters by seventeen writers. This change should aid in securing unity of treatment, though it tends to decrease the coöperative character of the whole work. For example, the domestic political history of France from the accession of Louis XVI to the establishment of the Directory, a period of twenty-one and a half years, is in the hands of only two writers.

If we disregard for the time being the division by chapters, the book permits of four general topical divisions. The first, the *ancien régime* in France, with treatment of philosophy, government, finance, and political history (1774-1788), occupies 118 pages; the second, the Revolution in France from the call of the States-General to the fall of the Directory, with special treatment of Revolutionary finance and law, occupies 333 pages; the third, the international military and naval history of the period, 1792-1799, occupies 199 pages; the fourth, the history, chiefly diplomatic, of the rest of Europe (*circa* 1780-1797), except in so far as it is incidentally treated elsewhere in the book, occupies 127 pages. These natural divisions, except in one or two notable instances, agree successfully with the separation and arrangement of chapters, though readers may dispute as to the wisdom of the above allotment of space, especially in the last-named division. With this brief statement as to the general plan, an expression of opinion on more specific matters now becomes possible.

Mr. P. F. Willert in the opening chapter writes of philosophy and the Revolution. He summarizes the tendencies and conclusions of seventeenth-century and eighteenth-century thought only to deny to philosophy direct causal value in the outbreak of the Revolution; but he recognizes the function of philosophy as that of expressing articulately what was the feeling of the people at large and he concedes its ability thereby to excite fervor, akin to that of a religious faith, in the hearts of those who had longed for a new and definite creed and a promised specific relief, and also to menace, in the minds of those who had defended or

palliated existing conditions, their belief in the essential righteousness of their order. Material conditions, rather than theory aside from fact, were the chief efficient. The views of politics and economics presented in the next three chapters are similarly marked by an unwillingness to recognize aught save material facts and by a temperate and non-partizan judgment which refuses to be led into mere adversative generalizations. The evils shown are concrete; the mistakes of a personal administration are differentiated from the evils of a theoretical system. It would, however, have added to the value of these opinions had a comparative method been followed to a greater extent. If we heard more of the *ancien régime* in the rest of Europe, the Revolution in France would acquire a more correct basis as to cause; but much has been gained when men consent to write of the advantages and advances as well as of the misfortunes and evils of France.

The heart of the work is contained in an even account of succeeding events in France, 1789-1795, which, for the period after the adoption of the constitution of 1791, threatens at times to become a chronicle. Further, the need of a discriminating and connected account of French diplomatic policy becomes evident. The Directory gets more vivid treatment in proportionately much less space; but here, as for the earlier years of the Revolution, the problem of construction should not have been as to the mere succession of events, but as to the proper subordination of details. The entire decade, however, profits by the illuminating survey of French law in the Revolution contributed by M. Paul Viollet and by the review of financial experiments and conditions given by Mr. Henry Higgs.

The military and naval history of the years 1792 to 1799 is the work of three writers. The land campaigns to 1795 are clearly described by Mr. R. P. Dunn-Pattison with welcome technical comment and explanation but without sufficient consideration of those political facts which would effectively relate the chapter to the history as a whole; nor are such matters as the policy of the allies, the militant revolutionary spirit, or the significance of the treaty of Basel satisfactorily treated elsewhere. The work of Mr. H. W. Wilson on the naval struggle, in this volume as in volume VII, also does not show a proper appreciation of the relation of the naval operations to the general principles and development of political policy; and in chapter xv failure to note the extent of the depredations of French privateers on the east of Africa and the neglect of the real purpose and bearing of the naval operations in the West Indies should be noted. The chapter on the naval operations in the Mediterranean would better have been consolidated with that by Mr. J. H. Rose on the Egyptian expedition. Mr. Wilson not only repeats part of Mr. Rose's work, but at least in one instance repeats himself; aside from a page or two condemning Nelson's Neapolitan policy, there is little in chapter xx which does not more properly belong in chapter xix. This, however, was a matter for the editors rather than for the individual contributors. It may be noted that Mr. Wilson and Mr. Rose differ slightly

as to the strength or classification of the French naval forces bound for Egypt. The accounts by Mr. Rose of the Italian campaigns, the Egyptian expedition, and the second coalition are all that could be desired.

The history of Europe outside of France, and of Europe in relation to the Revolution, in so far as such topics are included within this volume, constitutes the last general subject to be noticed. The chapters involved are x, xi, xvii, and xxv, an arrangement which does not on the whole appear very satisfactory, though a more closely connected scheme was probably not possible. Chapter x is by Mr. Oscar Browning and consists nominally of a survey of British foreign policy as inspired by Mr. Pitt (1783-1793); in reality it is almost a summary review of the diplomatic history of Europe for these years. The result is to obscure with detail the general line of British policy, while at the same time essential factors in the larger field are neglected; and the forces and events which, either openly or secretly, made for the outbreak of war with France in 1793 are not clearly marshaled. In view of this, chapters xi and xvii, which are by Mr. Richard Lodge, have a peculiar burden to bear; they can be estimated independently or in connection with what has been written by Mr. Browning and others. The editors alone can decide the question. One thing is obvious—that both writers deal in part with the same events and that repetition thereby becomes inevitable, not always, however, with identical interpretation or conclusion. A wider range was apparently given by the editors to Mr. Lodge, who covers the history of the Polish and Eastern questions during the last quarter of the century. With the aid of an excellent grasp of the material, he has successfully treated a complicated subject. It is only fair to add, however, that several matters dealt with in these three chapters are still open to discussion. The concluding chapter of the volume is entitled “Europe and the French Revolution” and is thirty-six pages in length. It consists of a series of abstracts reviewing in convenient fashion, nation by nation, the intellectual opinions of the chief minds in Europe concerning the Revolution. There is no attempt to gather up the loose threads or to measure the real influence of the Revolution.

The general result of all this tends to make the volume a narrative political history of France and of French activities in the last decade of the eighteenth century. This is somewhat balanced by the fact that, except for the work of Mr. Rose, the institutional and administrative topics receive on the whole the best treatment. With but few and generally unimportant exceptions, the spirit and judgment shown deserve special recognition. Many of the time-worn but misleading generalizations, perpetuated in spite of the results of research, have been discarded. As a rule fairness and moderation based on recognition of a wide range of facts characterize the work. As compared with preceding volumes of the series the result is a slight advance, though most of the natural limitations and dangers of the coöperative method, as well as some of its advantages, might find illustration here. The editors have not as yet en-

tirely succeeded in giving coherence, nor have they been able properly to relate chapters on domestic topics to those which deal with foreign affairs. Europe during the Revolution, apparently intentionally, suffers for lack of sufficient or connected treatment. Yet whatever doubts remain concerning the construction of the book, it should be welcome for the wealth of information it supplies and for the impartial review of fiercely-debated questions which it affords. As a rule it exhibits the tested results of sound scholarship.

ALFRED L. P. DENNIS.

The Constitutions and other Select Documents illustrative of the History of France, 1789-1901. By FRANK MALOY ANDERSON. (Minneapolis : The H. W. Wilson Company. 1904. Pp. xxi, 671.)

THE work of the teacher of modern French history will be rendered easier and more effective by the publication of Professor Anderson's volume. Aside from a few documents printed in the University of Pennsylvania *Translations and Reprints*, there has been little illustrative material available for this subject. Professor Anderson's selection has been made with special reference to the requirements of practical work. One of the limitations upon the use of documents in the class-room is the relatively small amount of information which may be extracted from them unless the student is already familiar with the subject and understands what questions to address to his documents. The editor has sought in many cases to minimize this limitation by choosing several documents which illustrate the principal elements of a single topic. For example, he includes nine upon the "Convention and Religion", eight on the "King's Flight" to Varennes, eight upon the "July Revolution", and nine upon the "Proclamations and Decrees of the Provisional Government of 1848". With such groups the student should be able to work in partial independence of his text-book. The same is true on a larger scale with the many constitutions of France, which are printed in full. The term documents is employed in a broad sense, embracing decrees, laws, treaties, petitions, and official letters. Since 482 out of 660 pages are given to the Revolution and the Empire, the volume will be of especial assistance in the study of these periods.

As Professor Anderson remarks, there will be differences of opinion upon the principle of selection, and possibly upon its details. Although the title emphasizes "Constitutions", the necessity of complete translations of each may be questioned. The constitution of 1795 covers forty-two pages. Would it not have been possible to summarize the less significant articles, so that the ordinary undergraduate might not be in danger of losing his way in the search for the principal features of the new government? Again, the constitution of 1830 is a verbatim reproduction of the charter of 1814, with a few omissions and changes. If these changes were noted, the other articles need not be reprinted. Professor

Anderson's plan of complete translations of constitutions has given to those of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic periods nearly as much space as has been reserved for all the documents of the period from 1815 to 1901. Such a distribution of space has necessitated the omission of material illustrating important phases of French economic and institutional development. There is nothing on the assignats except a portion of the decree of May 10, 1794. In at least one case further material is needed to guard the student against misconception. The decrees of August, 1789, abolishing the feudal system, cannot be understood without careful comparison with the decree of March 15, 1790, which reversed in part the principle of abolition proclaimed in August.

In his notes introductory to each document, Professor Anderson has referred only to the most available books. It would have been well, however, in giving the decrees upon the formation of the Revolutionary Tribunal and the Committee of Public Safety to have mentioned Wallon's *Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire de Paris* and Aulard's *Recueil des Actes du Comité de Salut Public*.

HENRY E. BOURNE.

La Peur en Dauphiné (Juillet-Août 1789). Par PIERRE CONARD, Ancien Élève de l'École Normale Supérieure Agrégé d'Histoire. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Moderne, Tome I, Fascicule 1.] (Paris: Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition. 1904. Pp. 283.)

THIS monograph is a microscopic study of the Great Fear in a single province of France. In time as well as in space its limits are narrow. The first tremor of the great popular apprehension was felt in Dauphiné July 27. Becoming quickly a panic, it raged for three days with great violence and much damage to the landed nobility of the province. Two of the six chapters of M. Conard's book are devoted to these four days. They present a detailed, critical, and graphic history of a popular movement, obscure in origin, rapid in development, terrifying in many of its manifestations, fruitful in its results. The author traces with gratifying precision and clearness the first appearance of the fateful rumor, the course of its dispersion along the different country roads, the hour of its arrival at this town and that, and its effect in the various communities. He shows how a vague report of an invasion of brigands or of Sardinian soldiery became transformed into a passionate attack on the feudal privileges of a landed aristocracy. It was not at all for this that the peasants flocked together, but solely to help defend the fatherland against an unknown danger. Finding that the alarm was a false one, humiliated, indignant, they first began their work of destruction as a revenge upon the nobles, who, they believed, had set this rumor afloat for some malignant purpose. Immediately there was an irresistible insurgence of all their long-pent-up hatred of aristocratic oppression. They began striking wildly, burning châteaux, and violently assaulting individuals. But they quickly came to see that the one thing needful was not the destruction of

persons or of buildings, but of titles. M. Conard describes the methodical, keen-scented pertinacity of these ignorant peasants in this hunt, their immediate detection of any subterfuge or deception on the part of those whom they were forcing to relinquish the hated registers that described the various forms of their subjection to the nobility.

In a preliminary chapter the author describes the material situation of the peasants throughout the province, their sense of complete estrangement from the existing régime, and in succeeding chapters the vacillating conduct of the authorities at the beginning of this brief social war and their revengeful policy after it was over. The interplay of other factors in the tragedy, the attitude of the bourgeoisie, of the artisans of the towns, of the National Assembly, are shown with admirable lucidity and impersonality, and with minute detail. M. Conard's conclusion is that we are not concerned with a "conspiracy" or with a "commotion électrique" but simply with the transmission from village to village and from province to province of a piece of news which had at the beginning, perhaps, some foundation.

The book is thoroughly documented and rests upon an exhaustive examination of municipal and departmental archives, mostly unpublished. It contains over one hundred pages of *pièces justificatives* and a valuable map of Dauphiné taken from the *Atlas National* of the year 2. It is also well indexed.

° CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

Les Origines des Cultes Révolutionnaires, 1789-1792. Par ALBERT MATHIEZ. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Moderne, Tome I, Fascicule 2.] (Paris: Société Nouvelle de Librairie et d'Édition. 1904. Pp. 151.)

THE Société d'Histoire Moderne, which was founded in July, 1901, is becoming the promoter of a number of enterprises of importance to the study of modern French history. During 1904 the society began the publication of a series of historical monographs and documents, after the manner of the German *Beiträge*. If the contents of the first volume are to be taken as a sample of what the series is to become, the undertaking will surely prove an important one. In addition to the subject of the present review, the initial volume contains: *La Peur en Dauphiné, juillet-Août 1789*, by Pierre Conard; *Le Grand Bureau des Pauvres au Milieu du XVIII^e Siècle*, by Léon Cahen; and *Les Procès-Verbaux du Comité de Travail de l'Assemblée Constituante de 1848*, edited by Georges Renard. Excellent judgment has been shown in the mechanical make-up of the series, and the careful and complete tables of contents and indexes contribute largely to the usefulness of the studies.

The present number is, as the author himself acknowledges, an attempt to establish a new historical thesis concerning the Revolutionary cults, and not an impartial and complete study of the origins of those religious manifestations. Considered as a thesis and not as a history,

the pamphlet has the merit of setting the whole religious history of the Revolution in a new light, making what have seemed unrelated or accidentally related phenomena appear as the expressions of a new national religious motive. The national festivals, the adoration of Marat, the Worship of Reason, the Worship of the Supreme Being, Theophilanthropy, and the *Culte décadaire*, instead of being merely political manifestations, appear preëminently religious in character. The religious manifestations of the Revolution are to be treated not as politics, not as irreligion, but as religion, and as parts of a whole.

M. Mathiez sets forth his thesis in the following manner (p. 13):

Si je montre que les révolutionnaires. . . ont eu, malgré leurs divergences, un fond de croyances communes, s'ils ont symbolisé leurs croyances dans des signes de ralliement pour lesquels ils professèrent une véritable piété, s'ils ont eu des pratiques, des cérémonies communes où ils aimaient à se retrouver pour manifester en commun une foi commune, s'ils ont voulu imposer leurs croyances et leurs symboles à tous les autres Français, s'ils ont été animés d'une fureur fanatique contre tout ce qui rappelait les croyances, les symboles, les institutions qu'ils voulaient supprimer et remplacer, si je montre tout cela, n'aurai-je pas le droit de conclure qu'il a existé une religion révolutionnaire, analogue en son essence à toutes les autres religions? Et s'il en est ainsi, comment continuer à ne voir, dans les cultes révolutionnaires, que je ne sais quelles constructions factices, quels expédients improvisés, quels instruments éphémères au service des partis politiques?

With this conception in mind, the author cites Rousseau and the other eighteenth-century philosophers, and then reviews the religious measures of the Constituent and Legislative Assemblies and their manifestations of patriotic enthusiasm, and carefully enumerates all of the more or less spontaneous expressions of religious and patriotic feeling by the people. He studies the enactment of the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, the treatment of the priests whether jurors or nonjurors, the attitude of the anticlerical papers such as the *Feuille Villageoise*, the federations, the civic oaths, the civic festivals, the posthumous honors paid to Voltaire, to Mirabeau, and to other friends of liberty, the patriotic prayers and hymns, the cockades and liberty-trees and national altars. All these the author considers the expressions of a religion whose creed is to be found in the Declaration of the Rights of Man. The fundamental principle of this new faith is that the chief end of man is the pursuit of happiness, that man possesses in himself the means of attaining happiness, and that the highest expression of this endeavor is by the people as a nation. Hence the love of country and the honoring of the nation's benefactors are religious acts, for they are the adoration of the noblest manifestations of the supreme religious principle.

Obviously the conclusions of this thesis will not commend themselves to Catholics any more than the whole religious policy of the Revolutionists has done. Protestants, in like manner, will find it difficult to accept them fully. Views repugnant to Christians concerning events that shock

Christians are not for that reason false. In fact it is reasonable that the religious history of the Revolution, which is a chapter of anticlericalism, should be more correctly analyzed by an avowed anticlerical like M. Mathiez than by the Christians who are shocked by the very facts which they are studying. Certainly the sympathies of an anticlerical should be accorded equal respect with the horrified sensibilities of the martyrologist, if the historian is to be impartial. A detailed criticism of this thesis is impossible within the limits of this review, for it would necessarily start with the determination of the validity of the definition of religion which the author has assumed.

GEORGE M. DUTCHER.

La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt, 1747-1827. Par FERDINAND-DREYFUS.
(Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1903. Pp. xvi, 547.)

A BIOGRAPHY of the duke de La Rochefoucauld-Liancourt was issued in 1827 and again in 1831 by his son. As an account of the duke's character, position, and ideas, the work was valuable. In details it was not always accurate. The present work, an exhaustive study of a great mass of material, is not a biography alone; the last three of its eleven chapters discuss at length the institutions and reforms in which the duke was concerned. Liancourt was a royalist and a democrat. He despised Louis XV and disliked Marie Antoinette enough to decline to her face a request that his wife should become her lady of honor. Louis XVI he respected. Before the Revolution the duke founded the first technical school in France. Its centenary was celebrated in 1880. In 1789 he sat at Versailles for the nobles of Clermont, and supported voting *par tête* and the abolition of privileges. In the National Assembly his activity centered in the Comité de Mendicité, of which he was president. At the time the church controlled public charity. The committee's reform embodied the principle, which obtains to-day, that the state must be its own almoner and must dispense its assistance without regard to creed. In 1792 Liancourt failed in a project to bring Louis XVI from Paris to Rouen. He fled to England, but applied in December to become the king's advocate before the Convention. Barère, then president of the Convention, had sat also on the Comité de Mendicité. By pocketing Liancourt's application, he saved his former associate possibly from the fate of Malesherbes.

The years 1795 to 1798 Liancourt spent in America. In his *Voyage dans les États-Unis d'Amérique*, a work of eight volumes, his comments are flattering at times and always frank. In spite of promiscuous domestic arrangements due in part to cramped quarters, the virtue of American women he found above reproach. The vice of the lower class was drunkenness. In Harrisburg, among its three hundred houses he counted thirty-eight saloons. In 1795, while in the wilds of Canada, the duke, who was out of sympathy with the plottings at Coblenz, received a request from Louis XVIII to resign his post as grand master of the robes. He refused. The post was hereditary in his family by right of purchase.

For this refusal, Lord Dorchester, pettily enough, expelled him from Canada. The 18th Brumaire restored Liancourt to France. Of his sequestered estates, a portion, including his château, had been saved from alienation by connivance of the authorities of Oise, where the duke was popular. The duchess in 1792 had obtained a divorce on the ground of her husband's emigration. By this device, not uncommon at the time, she preserved her own property. She remained in France but established herself on the frontier in a French villa from which she could adjourn at any moment to a Swiss garden. She survived the duke three years. After his repatriation she was associated with him from time to time in beneficence. They never remarried.

Under the Empire Liancourt was active in a number of unsalaried offices which he retained under the Restoration until the reaction of the early twenties. On July 15, 1823, Corbière notified him that he was retired from the office of inspector-general of the Conservatoire des Arts et Métiers, from the council-general for prisons, the council-general for manufactures, the council for agriculture, the council-general for the Paris hospitals, and the council-general for the department of Oise. In his reply on the sixteenth, Liancourt twitted the minister with forgetting in this formidable list the duke's presidency of the committee on vaccination. On the same day this committee was abolished. The government pressed its vengeance to the grave. At the duke's funeral in Paris, the pupils at Châlons wished to carry their dead benefactor. The police, pleading express orders, commanded them to place the body on the hearse. In the scuffle which followed, the coffin fell to the pavement and broke, and the duke's body was soiled in the gutter. The affair was discussed in the Chambers, and the king, against the wish of Corbière, expressed to the family his regret for the occurrence.

H. M. BOWMAN.

Napoleon the First: a Biography. By AUGUST FOURNIER. Translated by MARGARET BACON CORWIN and ARTHUR DART BISSELL. Edited by EDWARD GAYLORD BOURNE, Professor of History in Yale University. (New York: Henry Holt and Company. 1903. Pp. xviii, 836.)

THE hackneyed proverb that the most valuable things often come in small packages is once again exemplified by the history of the great Corsican written by Dr. Fournier, a member of the Austrian Chamber of Deputies and professor in the University of Prague, which was originally published in German in three volumes 1886-1889, and, after being translated into French by E. Jaeglé in 1892, now appears in English as a result of the joint labors of Professor Bourne, Mrs. Corwin, and Mr. Bissell, assisted by an earlier unpublished translation made by Mr. F. H. Schwan.

Almost every student who has become thoroughly conversant with the unique era of nineteen years (1796-1815) which has been roughly

styled the Napoleonic, had been obliged to obtain his knowledge by wading laboriously through the countless works which treat of that period in nearly all its varied aspects, and has often been at a loss for an answer when confronted by the question, "What is the best short history of Napoleon for the general reader?" His mind at once recurs to the endless pages contained in the voluminous works of recognized authorities like Sloane, Thibaudeau, Bignon, and Thiers; Scott, Abbott, and Hazlitt he rejects as untrustworthy, Lanfrey as too envenomed, and Alison as not wholly accurate, while both Fyffe and Lavissee and Rambaud embrace all Europe. Of the two-volume histories unquestionably the best is Rose, although due allowance must be made for a slightly biased point of view of certain episodes, but this work comprises not less than a thousand pages. Of the single-volume histories Ropes is merely a series of interesting lectures incorporated into book form; Seeley is so rabidly hostile as to destroy all sense of perspective and hence all merit; while William O'Connor Morris, although distinctly good, is by no means so profound as many of the others.

The solution of this perplexing question is fortunately to be found in Fournier's *Napoleon*, which not only condenses within its two covers the essence of the knowledge given by the best authorities, but treats it with a directness, impartiality, and breadth of view which cannot fail to demonstrate that its author possesses, as the result of the most profound research and painstaking consideration of all the dominant influences, a grasp of this difficult subject unsurpassed by any of the general historians of this many-sided colossus. Although unquestionably "Drudgery is the gray angel of success" and although Fournier's work is manifestly the outcome of many years of unremitting labor and most careful thought, it is far from being the product of a plodder; on the contrary, the vigorous mentality of the writer is evident on every page, and sparks of light fly at every blow of his intellectual hammer as he forges with master hand his chain of historical evidence, every intricate link of which stands out clear and distinct. The reader's interest never flags, for the reason that the style is always vivid and frequently dramatic, and that each link is shown in its true proportions and relationship to all the others. Another feature of this work is the admirable classified bibliography, which is of inestimable value as a guide for the reader of the Napoleonic era or for the librarian who has constant use for a comprehensive manual. The French edition, which contained many works not mentioned in the German original, was used as the basis for the English translation; and Professor Bourne has added a large number of recently published books, although some notable articles and monographs have escaped his attention and some unimportant errors in spelling have been overlooked. The work of the translators has been admirably done, but more careful proof-reading would have eliminated a few typographical errors.

The greatest characteristic of Fournier's history, and the one which perhaps distinguishes it from all the others, is the irrefutable logic with which he demonstrates that the principal motives and actions of Napoleon

were dictated by a fixed policy, from which he never swerved. If authorities most competent to give testimony regarding the events in which they participated are entitled to any weight, then Fournier is not wanting in convincing argument; and his contention reminds one most forcibly of the famous diatribe against Napoleon by Châteaubriand, who declared: "His part, invented by himself, was terribly unique. Never was there so ambitious, so restless a spirit; never so daring, so fortunate a soldier. His aim was universal dominion, and he gazed at it steadfastly with the eye of the eagle and the appetite of the vulture."

Napoleon has often been termed "the child of the Revolution", and the appellation is undoubtedly justified, since the First Consul himself retorted to Josephine, when she pleaded for leniency toward the Duc d'Enghien, "I am the man of the State, I am the French Revolution, and I shall uphold it" (p. 273). The Convention and the Directory bequeathed to their successors certain policies which assisted materially to mold the course of France for many years after those governments had passed out of existence. The "theory of the liberation of nations" was soon metamorphosed into implying facilitation of conquest; and peace, as Mallet du Pan wrote in 1795, "must be understood to mean submission" (p. 190). The extension of the boundaries of France was stoutly opposed by England, against which opposition retaliatory measures were promptly directed, so that there was formulated "as early as the summer of 1796, a clearly defined intention not only to land an army in the British Islands, but also to annihilate that country by closing to her commerce all the ports of all Europe" (p. 190). The Directory busied itself also with "rousing Persia to rebellion, working up Constantinople, and peopling Hindostan with its emissaries" (p. 191), so as to attack England through her richest possession. The idea of secularizing the German ecclesiastical principalities originated with the Girondists, and in 1795 the celebrated Abbé Sieyès suggested a plan for indemnifying and aggrandizing the secular principalities at the expense of the ecclesiastical, which was carried out with slight modifications during the Consulate (1803). A league of Rhenish princes under French protection, to act as "buffer states", was also broached during 1798, and eight years later bore fruition in the establishment of the Confederation of the Rhine under the suzerainty of Napoleon. In a like manner arose the policy of crowding Austria and Prussia, the most dominant states of the continent, as far as possible toward the east, for the obvious reason, as Sieyès reported from Berlin in 1798, that the German coast bordering on the North Sea was "for France the most important portion of the earth's surface in view of the fact that by means of it the Directory may at its will close to English commerce all the markets and all the ports of the Continent from Gibraltar as far as Holstein or even to the North Cape" (p. 191).

These far-reaching schemes, which embraced substantially the entire continent, were formulated without semblance of method or system, but they awakened a dormant movement which contained germs that took deep

root in the new life of France. The Convention was supplanted by the Directory; this in turn fell before the "man of destiny", who possessed not only the perspicacity and insight to understand the vast latent possibilities of these policies, but also the power to carry them into execution, especially since they conformed to his own desire for universal dominion. With these facts always in view, the motives and actions of the great emperor are perfectly clear and logical, for once in control of the requisite power "Napoleon followed, it is true, the course of development which France was undergoing, but always with the stamp of his own individuality and according to his own judgment" (p. 211).

There is a German proverb to the effect that God sees to it that the tree does not grow up to the heavens, and Napoleon is a notable example. Knowing that he used France as a ladder to climb to heights which in civilized ages it is not intended for man to attain, we are minded to ask, "By what means did he enslave France to the extent that she willingly left the bones of her sons to bleach from the sands of Syria to the snows of Russia in order to gratify his insatiable ambition?" There are two answers; the first is given by Châteaubriand:

"The weight of the chains which he imposed upon France was forgotten in their splendor; it was glorious to follow him, even as a conscript. The arts became servile in his praise, and Genius divided with him her immortal honors. For it is the mind alone which can triumph over Time."

The second answer is that of Talleyrand to Mme. de Rémusat when she complained of Napoleon's evil qualities:

"Child that you are, why is it that you are always putting your heart in all that you do? Trust me, do not compromise it by feeling any attachment for that man, but be assured that, with all his faults, he is still very necessary to France, which he knows how to uphold and to this object each of us ought to contribute all in our power" (p. 406).

FREDERIC L. HUIDEKOPER.

Personal Reminiscences of the First Duke of Wellington. By the late GEORGE ROBERT GLEIG, M.A. Edited by his daughter, MARY E. GLEIG. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1904. Pp. x, 409.)

GLEIG's intimacy with Wellington began in 1829 and was continued until 1852. His relations with the duke were closest from 1829 to 1834, and most intimate in 1831 and 1832, when Gleig was much in counsel with the duke as to the means by which the Grey administration could be overthrown and the Reform Bill wrecked. His reminiscences of the duke as a soldier form a small and immaterial part of the present volume, which is almost wholly concerned with the duke's career in politics and with his place in society. Gleig was an admirer of the duke, but was much more restrained and discriminating in his admiration than Croker. He was a Tory of the most pronounced Bourbon type; and he was a Bourbon to the last. While his political convictions were as intense as

those of Wellington, he put forward no claims for Wellington as a statesman.

Wellington's political career was practically comprised within the four years from 1828 to 1832; and in retrospect it half a century later, Gleig concludes that the duke has no title to rank as a constitutional politician or as a political leader, and that it is beyond denial that the duke's two years in office as first lord of the treasury added nothing to the glory which his eminent services in the field had insured him. "I have often heard him say"; Gleig adds, "that they were to himself the most unsatisfactory in the course of a long life."

It is of the years when Wellington was premier and of those in which he was concerned with the futile opposition to the Reform Bill that Gleig's *Reminiscences* are of most value. Notwithstanding the many memoirs covering that period which have been published, among which on the Tory side the *Croker Papers* are so enlightening and important, Gleig's volume throws much new light on the Tory position, on the tactics of the Tory party, and on the personality of the Tory leaders between the death of Canning and the incoming of the short-lived Tory administration under Peel in 1835. They tell over again, but with freshness and much additional new matter, the history of the break-up of the Tory party after Catholic emancipation had been conceded in 1829. They also make much clearer a matter which has always been a subject of much speculation: namely, how it came about that while the landed aristocracy could before 1830 control more than half the members of the House of Commons, Grey after the elections of 1830 and 1831 could command sufficient votes to carry the Reform Bill. The fact was that the rank and file of the Tory party were convinced that reform was necessary and inevitable, and they were not prepared to rally to the support of any Tory administration whose leaders held the Bourbon views of reform that were held by Wellington and by men of lesser importance like Croker and Gleig. Gleig found this out when he sought to organize the Tory squirearchy of the county of Kent to oppose reform. He had proof of it in another quarter when as the emissary of Wellington he endeavored to bribe several of the London daily newspapers to open their editorial pages to attacks on Grey and the reformers, which were to be inspired by the duke, by Lord Mahon, and by a few other extreme men who had thrown in their fortunes with the duke, such as Croker and "Billy" Holmes, an Irish adventurer in politics who had become whip and borough-broker for the Bourbon Tories. Money was raised to hire two or three London newspapers — none of them now in existence — to support the duke's opposition to the Reform Bill. But the proprietors, in addition to demanding heavy pay for the use of their editorial pages, insisted on compensation for the loss of circulation which they were confident would follow advocacy of an unpopular political cause. Nothing came of this scheme. Nothing came of another scheme to use the drill-meetings of the yeomanry cavalry to arouse hostility to reform; and nothing came of a third scheme, or rather a plot, to bring about disunion

in Earl Grey's cabinet. Wellington, who had hitherto had nothing but contempt for the press, was zealous for the scheme of bribing the London newspapers; but the suggested use of the yeomanry and the plot to dis-unite the cabinet were low political devices to which even when urged on him by a clergyman — for Gleig was at this time a beneficed clergyman in Kent — he would give no countenance. Bourbon Tory as Wellington was, these reminiscences show that at a most critical and disturbing time for the Tory party he stood on a much higher level in politics than the Crokers and the Gleigs and the Billy Holmeses whom he had permitted to surround him and take part in his political councils.

Gleig wrote well, and his ability to write stayed with him to his last years. The only drawback to his *Reminiscences* is one that is common to most books of this class which do not fall into the hands of an editor like Jennings. Dates are too sparingly given; and there are frequent references to minor events and minor figures in politics long ago forgotten. Even for the present generation of English readers, foot-notes are frequently necessary; and Miss Gleig, who has seen the book through the press, has left it without a foot-note from the first page to the last. It might have been thought that little new in the way of diaries and memoirs of the period between Waterloo and the Reform Act could be forthcoming. But this year has seen two valuable additions — one from each political party. The present volume, not containing so much material as the *Creevey Papers*, is of nearly the same historical value.

EDWARD PORRITT.

Journal des Campagnes du Baron Percy, Chirurgien en Chef de la Grande Armée (1754-1825). Publié d'après les manuscrits inédits par M. ÉMILE LONGIN. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1904. Pp. lxxvii, 537.)

BARON PERCY was not of English origin. His father, originally from the village of Parcey in the department of Jura, was a country surgeon at Montagny in Haute-Saône. The son, a brilliant student and a favorite pupil of the celebrated Louis, won with such regularity the annual prize of the Académie Royale de Chirurgie that he was requested, in order to revive waning competition, to compete no longer. After holding a number of lower positions, he succeeded Sabatier in 1792 as consulting surgeon of the Army of the North. Thence he passed to the Moselle, Rhine, and Danube. In 1800 he was with Moreau. Appointed after the peace of Lunéville to a chair at the École de Santé and to the office of surgeon-general of the army, he followed Napoleon from 1806 to 1809 and again to Waterloo. The last service cost Percy his post in the army but not the friendship of Louis XVIII, whom he had attended during the First Restoration. A disease of the eyes barred him from the Russian campaign.

Eulogies of Percy by his contemporaries, both medical and military, are many and warm. General Lecourbe styled him the father and stay

of military surgery. It appears in fact that Percy at least shares the honor, usually ascribed to Larrey alone, of inventing the mobile ambulance. Napoleon, who in later years addressed him familiarly in conversation, created him a baron of the Empire in 1810 and bequeathed him fifty thousand francs. By Alexander I and Frederick William III he was received in private audience at Tilsit. The same monarchs decorated him with the orders of Sainte Anne and of the Red Eagle at Paris in 1814, and Percy allowed himself the pleasure of declining at this time a snuff-box offered him by the English ambassador in the name of George III. Why has the recipient of such honors been forgotten, while the name of Larrey is remembered? Larrey published in many volumes the record of his activity and left a son prominent under the Second Empire; Percy was childless, and concerning him, beyond the biography by his nephew Laurent issued in 1827, little was printed. A work on Percy by M. Dujardin-Beaumetz, himself a retired chief surgeon of the French army, is now under way, and M. Longin's introduction is a judicious appreciation of Percy's career and character. The journal itself is not intact, and the editor is convinced by search that the lost parts will not be recovered. It opens with Jourdan's operations in 1799; the bulk of it, three hundred pages, narrates the campaigns of 1806 and 1807; the rest recounts the Spanish campaigns of 1808 and 1809. Much space is given by Percy to interesting descriptions of the districts through which he is passing and to comments, at times startling enough, upon the people. The distinctive feature of the journal is, however, that it paints war as it appears to the surgeon and really is—a shambles. To the horrors of non-anesthetic surgery was added in this case bad administration of supplies. At Marienburg in July, 1807, amputations were performed with a common knife and a mechanic's saw. Such extreme cases, more common under the Directory, became rare under Napoleon. But corruption was rampant. At a hospital near Cüstrin in August, 1807, Percy found the daily supply of meat, fixed at five hundred pounds, shortened by dishonest contractors to one hundred and sixty. The case was typical; and "His Majesty", adds Percy, "knows it, swears, and flies into a passion, and the abuse continues."

Percy's character as revealed in these pages justifies the regard felt for him by his contemporaries. In a skeptical and scoffing age he always carried a Bible, and he was genuinely touched when Pius VII, whom he attended at Fontainebleau, offered in return a mass for the recovery of Percy's aged mother. A faithful son of the church, he was unbiased enough to complain that the nuns at Pultusk, and in Poland generally, were grasping, vicious, and, except the younger who still were in the fervor of their calling, without humanity toward the wounded. The last was with Percy a tender point. The sights of a field-hospital, he writes at Friedland, although he had seen little else for sixteen years, never left him cold. Next to the wounded, his chief concern was the welfare of his assistants and the proper recognition of their services. His sympathy with distress was indiscriminate and genuine. With Frederick William

at Tilsit he wept over the fate of Prussia, and at Guttstadt in the same year, when a fellow surgeon tossed a famishing girl a coin, useless in a place stripped of provisions, Percy shared with her his bread and wine. Only by the influence of Moreau was he saved in 1800 from the penalty, presumably death, for assisting émigrés. Percy, indeed, with all his tenderness, was the soul of courage, not merely in battle. Thrice in 1799 and 1800 he received complaining letters from superiors at Paris. Twice he replied bluntly that he had no need of the ministry or of encomiums at Paris; one of these exchanges of compliments he inserted verbatim in Strasburg journals. The third letter, a voluminous, unprepaid exhortation to generosity which cost him over a franc in postage, he returned to the senders and suggested that they put more of that virtue in the carriage of their letters. His desertion of Louis XVIII for Napoleon in 1815 was not so blameworthy as it might at first sight seem. By instinct he was a man of the old régime, but his heart was with the men of the new.

H. M. BOWMAN.

Geschichte der Schweiz im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert. I. Die Schweiz unter französischem Protektorat. Von WILHELM OECHSLI, Professor of Swiss History in the Federal Polytechnicum and in the University of Zurich. (Leipzig: S. Hirzel. 1903. Pp. xviii, 781).

THIS is the first volume of the first special history of Switzerland during the nineteenth century written by an historian who was already an historian before writing it. The subject has proved so attractive of late years that one might fear that the publicists and statesmen it tempted had long since filled the book-stores of publishers. The name of Professor Oechsli, second to none among Swiss scholars, happily triumphed over such obstacles, and Hirzel's *Verlag* in Leipzig generously placed three volumes of their monumental *Staatengeschichte der neuesten Zeit* at his disposal. I can recommend the present volume as containing the most complete and most reliable account that has ever been printed of the fall of the *ancien régime* in Switzerland, the times of Helvetic Revolution, and the protectorate of Bonaparte over the confederation of which he called himself the *médiateur*. The reader will find here a precise and valuable description of the manifold eighteenth-century state governments, sham democracies, and petty aristocracies, whose narrow cantonalism prevented the *Bund* from forming one real state. "Man sprach und schrieb im letzten Jahrhundert viel vom schweizerischen oder helvetischen Freistaate. In Wirklichkeit war die Schweiz gar kein Staat. Sie besass gleichsam die Rohmaterialien zu einem solchen, ein Land, ein Volk und eine Geschichte; aber der Bau, den frühere Generationen begonnen, war unvollendet stecken geblieben und wieder zerfallen" (p. 20).

Professor Oechsli then proceeds to show with numerous references (especially to the big collection of Strickler, *Amtliche Sammlung der Akten aus der Zeit der Helvetischen Republik*, and to the *Correspondance*

de Napoléon I^{er}) how the Helvetic state was formed under the pressure of the French Revolution and of the armies of the Directory, first as a unitary republic, afterward, under the Consulate and by Bonaparte's imperative mediation, as a federative republic, France progressively assuming all the rights of protectorate.

I have only one criticism to offer concerning the masterwork of my learned colleague of Zurich, which indeed deserves every praise. It is with reference to his judgment of the men of the Revolution, who were fatally the men of French intervention in Swiss affairs, and of the First Consul's attitude toward our country. When treating these questions Swiss historians are still under the influence of their political environment. Generally for those that belong to old cantons Frédéric César Laharpe of Rolle and Peter Ochs of Basel, who were prominent in stirring up foreign intervention, are traitors, and Bonaparte is to be considered without question as an enemy of Switzerland. Quite a different opinion prevails in the cantons that owe their existence as states to the struggle of 1798 and the following years. In Vaud, for instance, Laharpe's memory is worshiped, and it is not unusual, even to-day, to find Bonaparte's portrait as young "général en chef de l'armée d'Italie" or "Premier Consul" in the place of honor in good old country-houses.

Professor Oechsli did much to free himself from prejudice in his excellent narrative of the overthrow of ancient abuses, but, as he tells us in his preface, he confined himself, for this part of the big work he has undertaken, to printed documents. I hope that the results of the investigations which are now in progress in public and private archives, under the auspices of the Valdese authorities, will encourage him to go still farther in the way of historical serenity. Valdese patriots, having no other way of obtaining from aristocratic Bern redress and political life, tried to induce the French government to intervene in their favor and, with bad arguments but with the help of Bonaparte, succeeded. Bernese history may have bitter words for them. They were the cause of foreign invasion and of the fall of Bern. World-history (and Professor Oechsli contributes a part of the *Staatengeschichte der neuesten Zeit*) ought not to treat them as different from the American patriots who, not many years before, had recourse to Louis XVI in order to be helped by French ships, French troops, and French money in their desperate struggle against their mother-country. It is only since the time when nations, when people with representative governments, in the modern sense of these words, were born, that recourse to foreign aid in internal affairs has ceased to be current and can be fairly branded as historically treasonable.

CHARLES BORGEAUD.

A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century. By JOHN THEODORE MERZ. Vol. II. (London: Blackwood and Sons. 1903. Pp. xiii, 807.)

It is in one sense regrettable that the immense labor involved in this remarkable work has prevented the author from carrying out his original

intention of presenting it to the public as a whole. We have before us at present two volumes; and whereas the complete *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century* is to cover the development of political, social, historical, and philosophical ideas during that period, the present instalment deals only with that of scientific thought. This is unfortunate for the author, and even more so for the public, as it may safely be assumed that there are few men of science who will care to devote time to what appears at present little more than a retrospect of the branch of study in which they are interested, and that there are few students of history who will look at their subject widely enough to admit that the tracing of the development of human thought is their concern. And yet Mr. Merz's book promises to be, when completed, one of the most extraordinary and valuable achievements of history, and he has already proved his supreme endowment with many of the historian's greatest qualities — exact and profound learning, breadth of view, sobriety, lucidity, and freedom from prejudice.

Every day we are happily coming nearer a broader interpretation of the scope and utility of history, whatever the superficial indications may be. The tendency to narrow shows symptoms not of increasing strength, only of an increased number of supporters. The late Herbert Spencer, who disliked history and did not read it, has recorded his opinion that it should be considered merely the bricks and mortar of sociology, while Monsieur Langlois, whose name stands second to none in the field of historical science, has recently written, “ce qui manque ce ne sont pas les matériaux mais l'habitude de généralisation scientifique”. Is it not curious that the line of thought of two men starting from such opposite standpoints should approach so nearly? Is it not fairly arguable that it is the legitimate business of the historian to address himself to those evolutions of opinion and of the intellect that are destined, as civilization develops, to play an ever increasing part?

It is some such task as this that Mr. Merz has set himself. His present volumes deal with a section of his whole subject that the critic unlearned in science can only approach with diffidence. Yet some slight idea of what they contain can be given in a few words. First, the author recognizes three different national schools of scientific thought — the French, German, and English — and devotes a chapter to the consideration of the characteristics of each; the concluding pages of his chapter on German thought, in which he is concerned with the ideals implied in the word *Wissenschaft*, is particularly striking and will remind those that had the good fortune to hear it of a recent and eloquent address delivered by Professor Harnack at Harvard. Second, turning from this aspect of his inquiry, the author divides scientific thought into its branches — such as physical, morphological, astronomical, biological or vitalistic, psychophysical — and deals with each one in turn, tracing with an erudition that never fails the development of each study and of the theories connected with it down to the present day. And here, in passing, may be noted one more of the great qualities of Mr. Merz, that

he uses but few technical or metaphysical terms, never lets them obscure his perception of essential facts, and, although dealing with an enormous mass of detail, never loses the thread of his narrative and purpose.

There are many notable passages on the fundamental problems of human existence and thought in these volumes. Among them the narrative of the evolution of the conception of energy in the middle of the last century (II, 140-150) is remarkable for its lucidity. In this respect it is worthy of note that in Mr. Merz's opinion, "Next to the conceptions introduced by Darwin into the descriptive sciences, no scientific ideas have reacted so powerfully on general thought as the ideas of energy" (II, 136). A few pages further (II, 214) a determination of the relative importance and position of the morphological and genetic views of nature is a striking example of balanced and constructive criticism and judgment.

In his account of the origin and influence of statistical ideas Mr. Merz stops short of our most recent developments in the application of tabular systems to the teaching of literature and the fine arts. Few who reflect on some of the exaggerations of the last few years, on the statistical methods that are supplanting instead of supplementing accurate knowledge and educated taste, will doubt what these pages suggest at every turn, that in this as in every branch of scientific study there is a term which sooner or later must be reached. The prevailing view that there is no limit to the range of scientific investigation, that we can go on forever extending the bounds of human knowledge by the processes of which Newton and Leibnitz were the great pioneers, will hardly be confirmed by a careful perusal of Mr. Merz's book, will perhaps, indeed, be shaken. There are even passages in which he marks the point beyond which investigation can hardly proceed, as for instance in the study of molecular, protoplasmic, and cellular forms (II, 272). Indeed it appears not impossible that our present modes of thought or modes of approaching scientific inquiry, of which, essentially, the history dates back but a couple of centuries, have now reached their fullest expression, that before long, as possible fields of exploration are successively occupied, new intellectual fashions may set in, and that the modes of thought of the future may by a sort of repetition or reflex action be once more in the plane of generalization and speculation. Even now a reaction is setting in against the too drastic training of immature minds to the exclusive perception of the infinitely little; symptoms are to be seen that we may soon feel the value of training to a sense of the proportion and relation of things.

It is to be hoped that the scientific externals of these first two volumes will not dissuade students of history from reading them. In those that are to follow we shall be on much more familiar ground. Perhaps Mr. Merz will there expose for us the rationale of that vitiating influence of autocratic governments on historical writing of which such curious instances have been witnessed in France under Napoleon III, in Germany under William II. The extraordinary attitude of such a powerful thinker

as Cuvier toward his political masters is another manifestation of a similar phenomenon worthy of the great analytical and synthetic powers of Mr. Merz. In conclusion he may be congratulated on having written one of the most noteworthy books produced in England of recent years.

R. M. JOHNSTON.

Correspondance du Duc d'Enghien (1801-1804) et Documents sur son Enlèvement et sa Mort. Publiés pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par Le Comte BOULAY DE LA MEURTHE. Tome I. *Le Licenciement: La Conspiration de Georges.* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1904. Pp. lxvii, 521.)

A CERTAIN melancholy interest attaches to the fate of scions of unfortunate royal families. Personally as unimportant as Louis XVII or the Prince Imperial, the duke of Enghien because of his violent end as the political victim of the First Consul has unlike them attained to real historical importance. Most of the literature concerning the unfortunate duke possesses as little value as that relating to the son of Marie Antoinette or of the Empress Eugénie. Two books only of the many devoted to his career and fate have possessed real historical merit: *Les Dernières Années du Duc d'Enghien, 1801-1804*, by the Comte Boulay de la Meurthe (Paris, 1886) and *Le Duc d'Enghien, 1772-1804*, by Henri Welschinger (Paris, 1888). The centenary of the tragedy at Vincennes has given the occasion for the publication by the former of these writers of all of the correspondence and other primary materials relating to the fate of the last of the Condés so that the student of history might for himself investigate the proofs of his innocence and understand the motives which impelled the First Consul to an act of injustice, to a blunder which was worse than a crime. The editor has ransacked archives public and private from London to Moscow and from Stockholm to Naples, and has laid under contribution the varied printed sources. Naturally some of the most important documents, hitherto unpublished, are the personal correspondence of the Condé family drawn from the archives at Chantilly. The documents are arranged in this volume chronologically under five general headings so that they give a clear conception of the sequence and relation of events. Full notes and some appendixes explain necessary points, while a carefully written introduction correlates the whole mass of information. This volume covers the events prior to the arrest; the succeeding volume should contain all of the materials necessary for a full knowledge of the details of the tragedy itself.

Briefly stated, the first volume shows that the following were the preliminaries of the tragedy: Louis XVIII, king of France, as the royalists regarded him, was residing at Warsaw and seeking to secure his restoration by the creation of a public sentiment in France. He and the Condés, including the duke of Enghien, were opposed to assassination or conspiracy as a means to their end. Not so with the count of Artois (Charles X), who was residing at Edinburgh or in England, and who was alive for any intrigue that might accomplish his purpose. In 1803

he gave countenance to the schemes of Georges Cadoudal, the Chouan leader, and to those of the traitorous general Pichegru, and induced the two to coöperate in a single conspiracy, not for assassination but for an insurrection, in which Bonaparte should be slain and after which the Bourbons should be proclaimed. The plan required a Monk to effect the restoration, but Moreau, who was approached for that purpose, was too loyal a republican and too ambitious personally to consent to play such a rôle. Cadoudal demanded the presence in France of either the count of Artois or of his son, the duke of Berry, as a necessary preliminary to action. Naturally neither cared to risk himself within the reach of Bonaparte's police. These two refusals to act had wrecked the plan of Georges at the very moment when it was discovered to the police of the Consulate. In the opening months of 1804 Bonaparte was busy with the preparations for the war with England and with the plans for the creation of the empire. The sudden revelation of the conspiracy surprised Bonaparte in his ambitious dreams and showed him that all his plans depended upon his own life, which was in such imminent peril. He must strike a blow terrifying to all conspirators. The arrest of Moreau was clearly dangerous owing to his well-known republicanism and to his great popularity, but at the same time it was apparently a necessity which must be justified before public opinion. That too required some sudden and convincing stroke. The arrest in France and the summary execution of one of the principals, Artois or Berry, would have accomplished the purpose. In default of the proper victim, accident revealed to Bonaparte a noble victim, whose residence at Ettenheim in Baden, close to the French border, with certain other things, seemed to mark him out as a principal in the conspiracy of Georges. The resolution to strike the terrifying blow once formed, Bonaparte executed it with characteristic sureness and despatch.

To contemporaries it was clear that a great political blunder had been committed, but all of the convincing proofs of its awful injustice have only now been adduced. These documents show that the duke was opposed on principle to any such act as that of Georges, and that his first knowledge of the plot was the news of the arrest of the conspirators, whereupon he sat down and wrote to his grandfather, "*ces moyens ne sont pas de mon genre*". True, the duke was eager for the restoration of his family, not by foul means but by honorable effort. True also, he was a pensioner of England, he had borne arms against France, and was at the very moment seeking service under the English standard against France in the new war. Yet none of these things could have driven Bonaparte to the desperate measures which ended in the execution at Vincennes early in the morning of March 21, 1804. The necessity of terrifying assassins and conspirators was his sole justification. The blood of Louis XVI had been offered for the safety of the republic; the empire was to be consecrated by the blood of his cousin, the duke of Enghien: in such wise did "the deluge" overwhelm the Bourbons within a generation after the death of Louis XV.

GEORGE M. DUTCHER.

The Trail of Lewis and Clark, 1804-1904. By OLIN D. WHEELER.
(New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1904. Two
vols., pp. xxiii, 377; xv, 419.)

SUCH an account of the Lewis and Clark exploration as will avail to get the spirit and salient incidents of that achievement into the consciousness of this generation of Americans was greatly desired. Mr. Wheeler's work has in it the qualities that promise much toward the accomplishment of that end. Considerable previous experience with surveying parties in the far west gave him acquaintance with the plains, mountains, and cañons and gave him also zest for just the line of investigation that the preparation of these volumes demanded. Because of his long connection with the Northern Pacific railway he had unusual facilities for thorough field-work.

Passages from the texts of the Lewis and Clark journals and from the literature of the later exploration and development of the region traversed by the expedition are most skilfully chosen to bring out pictures of the scenes and the development of the important and critical incidents in the progress of the exploration. The author's narrative giving the setting and connection of the events upon which the attention is arrested is lively and effective. The text is strongly reinforced with a wealth of fine illustrations, including facsimiles of manuscript documents, reproductions of old cuts and drawings, and maps and photographs of the sites of incidents as they appear at the present time. The reader is thus enabled to see the successive stages of the historical process through which present-day conditions along the line of the trail were developed. The historical pilgrim or tourist with these books in his hands can with equal facility trace conditions back and see the difficulties encountered by Lewis and Clark and their party. We are made to see not only the topography of the country, but also the Indian life, and the animals and plants upon which the party depended for subsistence. This thoroughness of treatment is, however, confined to the part from Fort Mandan to the Pacific.

Mr. Wheeler makes us not only see the party as it moves along its toilsome and sometimes dangerous route, but also enter into their life. This he accomplishes by going carefully into the organization and personnel of the expedition. In this manner he contributes much new material to sources of the history of the exploration. Having acquainted us with the characteristics of the separate individuals, he is easily able to take us into their daily struggles and privations because of having had experiences himself somewhat similar to those of the explorers. Although the author is on the whole sympathetic with the conduct of the expedition, he is independent, and he comments with practical judgment upon the tactics and every-day conduct of the explorers.

There is an introductory chapter of twenty-six pages on "The Louisiana Purchase". This brings out correctly the priority of the inception of the exploration, but as an attempt at a review of the diplomatic history affecting this western country the chapter is a positive

blemish. It should be either rewritten or omitted. It must have been an afterthought. The following excerpts will serve as evidence: "Spain had held the island of New Orleans on both sides of the stream to its mouth" (p. 3): "This [the claim of the United States under the Louisiana Purchase] included the greater part of Texas—to which the claim of the United States would seem to have been a righteous one—west of the Great River; . . . the treaty of 1819, in which Spain ceded all of East and West Florida, and all country west of the Mississippi north of the forty-second degree of latitude and westward to the Pacific, to which she claimed ownership" (p. 15). The author also gets into trouble when, out of his province, he remarks that Meares sailed into Baker's Bay (II, 232). It is true that the British commission on England's claims to the Oregon country in 1826 made this claim, and that Travers Twiss contends for it as a fact, yet the log-book of Meares does not admit of that interpretation. In spite of such blunders, the work is well done and is readable.

F. G. YOUNG.

The Battle of New Orleans. By ZACHARY F. SMITH. [Filson Club Publications, Number 19.] (Louisville: John P. Morton and Company. 1904. Pp. xvi, 209.)

THE Filson Club, of Louisville, is a historical society which takes its name from John Filson, the first historian of Kentucky. Since 1884 it has been publishing in handsome octavo volumes various books on state history. One of the tasks which it gave itself was to publish in three dignified narratives the history of the three important battles of the War of 1812 in which Kentucky troops took prominent part. In accordance with this plan there appeared in 1900 *The Battle of Tippecanoe*, by Captain Albert Pirtle, in 1903 *The Battle of the Thames*, by Colonel Bennett H. Young, and now, in 1904, comes the last of the trilogy, *The Battle of New Orleans*, by Mr. Zachary F. Smith. These books are published in the handsome quarto style adopted by the Filson Club in the beginning of its series of publications. They are characterized by fine antique paper, beautiful type, generous margins, and adequate pictures, maps, and charts. The volumes taken all together make a worthy tribute to the patriotic zeal of the club and might well be imitated in other parts of the country.

In regard to the volume under review, the author brings to the performance of his task an evident impartiality and a commendable degree of judgment in the handling of material. Although, as we are informed, he was originally a Henry Clay Whig, brought up in the school which made the hatred of Jackson a standard of political orthodoxy, he has dealt with Jackson as a military leader in a manner which even so partial a biographer as Mr. Buell would approve. He has given us, also, a truthful picture of the main events of the campaign about which he writes, although it may not satisfy some readers who have a fondness for

much detail. In a matter which so much concerns the average Kentuckian as the controversy which was waged between Jackson and General Adair in regard to the conduct of the Kentucky troops on January 8 on the west bank of the Mississippi, Mr. Smith has shown a most satisfactory impartiality. He has been, in fact, so careful to do full justice here that one is apt to find that he has, in doing it, robbed his narrative of some of the interest which one always gets in watching the play of one debater against another. He has been so impartial that in this respect he becomes well-nigh commonplace. All through the book the author follows a steady, thoroughgoing pace worthy of a judge on the bench. So prominent is this fact that the reader will readily agree with the president of the Filson Club, who contributes an introduction to the volume, when he says (pp. xiv-xv), "If Jackson had been as unprejudiced against Adair as the author against Jackson, there would have been nothing like a stain left upon the escutcheon of the Kentuckians". To which the reviewer may add that if Jackson had been as two-sided a man as Mr. Smith, there would have been, very probably, no victory at New Orleans.

On the score of industry we must also commend the author. He has used most of the readily available printed material on the subject. He has shown that he is master of a clear and solid literary style. While he is in love with his task, he does not lack penetration or fairness. He is not sensational or trivial. In all of these qualities he shows that he has the faculty of writing good history.

But the modern historical student will find much wanting. He will find a lack of that balancing of evidence which is of all things his greatest delight. The debate in the mind of the writer between this and that; the candid revelation of how he ought to evaluate this piece of evidence and how that; the abundant use of foot-notes, both to give sources of information and to introduce matter which he does not want to put into the text; the hungry search for new facts; the discussion of the quality of Jackson's military genius; and all the other traits which constitute scientific method—these one does not find in this book. It is written after the style which obtained a half-century ago. Moreover, it is very condensed. There is a long introductory discussion of the events that preceded the battle, and a somewhat shorter account of the events that followed it. It is certainly true that one could get a better idea of what was done out of Parton's *Jackson* or out of Mr. Henry Adams's history. The point on which one would expect this work to be fullest, the controversy over the conduct of the Kentucky troops, is hardly more complete than in Parton. It does not become at this point a discussion, as one might desire, but follows the even tenor of a narrative. On this question the long correspondence between Jackson and Adair, which many historical students would be more than glad to see in an accessible form, is not given in whole or in part; and what is worse, there is no intimation as to where it may be found. As a source of information, therefore, the work has little value; as a popular narrative of the battle of New Orleans it is surpassed by many other accounts; as a

memorial of the Filson Club, expressive of its devotion to the cause of historical publication, it is worthy of all consideration.

Besides these defects, the book is not without errors of fact. For example, Jackson's mother did not die "of grief and the hardships of war", but of prison-fever (p. 160); it was not at Camden jail that the incident of Jackson's refusing to black the boots of a British officer occurred (p. 160); Jackson did not have a sister (p. 119); and when Jackson was fined by Judge Hall he did not take the money "from his pocket" and pay the fine, but sent it to the court by a messenger on the following day (p. 145). Of a very questionable nature, also, is the use of the interview of Mr. Buell with Governor Allen, of Ohio, in which the latter told in 1875 how the British had planned to retain possession of Louisiana, if they once conquered it (pp. 151-153). It is certain that this opinion of Jackson ought not to be regarded as sufficient to establish the point. Finally, in Mr. Smith's whole book there is hardly a note of criticism. Those who understand best the character and the career of the quick-tempered, rash, and untechnical Jackson will know that it is impossible to pass under review all his actions at New Orleans — which is in fact the most creditable phase of his career — without having occasion to pass an adverse judgment on some of them.

JOHN SPENCER BASSETT.

Les Voyages du Naturaliste Ch. Alex. Lesueur dans l'Amérique du Nord (1815-1837). D'après les Manuscrits et les Œuvres d'Art conservés au Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle de Paris et au Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle du Havre. Par le Dr. E. T. HAMY. [Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris, V, No. 1, March, 1904. Numéro dédié par la Société à l'Occasion de L'Exposition Universelle de Saint-Louis aux Académies et Sociétés Savantes des États-Unis d'Amérique.] (Paris: Société des Américanistes. 1904. Pp. 111.)

CHARLES ALEXANDER LESUEUR came to the United States in 1815 and, after a stay of twenty-two years here, returned to France, where he died in 1846. He was noted as a traveler and a draftsman. One of his early explorations was made under Napoleon, and in its published volumes his sketches first appeared. Before the last volume was issued (shorn of some of his best work lest it might irritate the English, for Napoleon had fallen and the Bourbons cared little for the glory of his empire), Lesueur had come to America, having signed an agreement in August, 1815, by which, with William Maclure, he became an associate in a proposed geological survey of the United States. Maclure was a man of fortune, who devoted himself primarily to natural history, but during a long stay in France shortly after the French Revolution gathered a large collection of pamphlets and books relating to that period. These are now in the library of the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

After some preliminary work in England, Maclure and Lesueur

spent some time in the West Indies, reporting their observations in the first volume of the *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia*. After a short stay in New York and Philadelphia, they went slowly to Pittsburg and Lake Erie, then through New England and New York, returning to Philadelphia, where Lesueur made his home from 1816 to 1825. Maclure had brought Lesueur to this country as a draftsman and naturalist; associated with him were Thomas Say, Gerard Troost, and some other foreign naturalists, all of whom labored with great zeal and success. Their contributions were published by the American Philosophical Society and later by the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia and in Silliman's *American Journal of Science and Arts*. Apart from his work with and for Maclure, Lesueur found employment as an engraver and as a teacher of drawing. The early volumes of the *Journal of the Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* contain many of his drawings and engravings.

The socialist colony at New Harmony, Indiana, established by George Rapp in 1814, was bought by Robert Owen. A party of men, women, and children, including Owen, Maclure, Say, Lesueur, and two teachers of the system of Pestalozzi, set out late in 1825 for New Harmony. Lesueur's journal of this trip, with illustrations from his own hand, is still preserved in the library of the museum at Havre. Two years of his life were spent there in scientific work, while Owen and Maclure were trying hard to introduce new methods of school-teaching as part of the kind of reform they hoped to bring into the world for its improvement. Lesueur seems to have had little interest or faith in Owen's schemes, but he worked steadily with the group of naturalists, including Say and Troost. The results of their scientific explorations were published in the *New Harmony Gazette*, the organ of the educational and social reforms tried with such poor success in the final outcome.

From 1828 to 1837 Lesueur made a number of journeys through what was then the almost unknown west and south. His travels covered the territory from Illinois to the delta of the Mississippi. His frequent visits to New Orleans, in order to collect his small French pension, gave him unusual opportunities for studying the prehistoric grave-mounds and other interesting ethnological and archæological objects of the Mississippi valley. His main work, however, was as an ichthyologist, and he added largely to the contemporary knowledge of the subject both in this country and abroad.

In 1838 Maclure went to Jalapa, Mexico, to introduce in that country the peculiar doctrines he shared with Owen; he died in Mexico in 1840. The death of Say and of another co-laborer, Barrabino of New Orleans, and the absence of Maclure and Troost, broke the ties that bound Lesueur to America; in 1837 he returned to France and renewed his old associations with the naturalists in Paris. Indeed, during his stay in America he had kept in touch with the leading French naturalists by correspondence, and had continued to contribute interesting speci-

mens and valuable papers to the French museums and scientific journals. In France he found employment at once in his own field and did much good work. He was employed in the museum of natural history in the Jardin des Plantes, and in 1845 was made curator of the new Havre Natural History Museum; he died in Havre after two years of service.

A memoir of Lesueur was read by George Ord before the American Philosophical Society, April 6, 1849, and published in the *American Journal of Science and Arts*, Second Series, VIII, 189-216. Lesueur's papers and drawings were divided between the museums of Paris and Havre; among them were forty boxes containing his collections; his manuscript zoölogical notes filled forty portfolios. Dr. Hamy, of the museum of Paris, has written for the Society of Americanists of Paris a sketch of Lesueur's life and work in America, and this sketch is now printed at the expense of the Duc de Loubat as a contribution to the meeting of scientific congresses at St. Louis. It is dedicated to the scientific societies of the United States as a tribute to the work of French explorers and naturalists in this country, and deserves the grateful acknowledgment of American scientists.

Lesueur had planned some large books; these, however, were never published, but his biography is accompanied by a bibliography of his writings published during his stay in America, showing that he left a long record of good work. An indefatigable draftsman, Lesueur made many sketches during his frequent journeys in this country; twenty-seven of his most interesting drawings, lithographs, and engravings are reproduced in this account of his life and work, adding greatly to its value and interest. The English quotations and references are full of proof-reader's mistakes, which mar a volume otherwise worthy of the subject.

J. G. ROSENGARTEN.

A History of Modern England. By HERBERT PAUL. In five volumes. Vols. I and II. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1904. Pp. vii, 450; vi, 446.)

THE stream of memoirs and biography and special studies which has long been pouring from the press gives us fair warning of the fact which books like those of Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Bright, Sir Spencer Walpole, and these volumes by Mr. Paul are the earliest expression. The nineteenth century, and, in English affairs, the Victorian era, now belong to the ages and to the historian. The borders of the historical field, not so long ago bounded by 1815 or 1832, have been pushed to the middle of the century, to the Berlin Congress, and have now definitely extended themselves to the end of Victoria's reign or of the century; and what was so recently politics that we can scarce think of it as anything else now appears in a new and not always well-fitting guise, as the advance-guard of histories makes its entry. Few if any of these have been on such a scale and with such a field as this now before us. It begins with

a chapter on "The Last Whig Government", specifically with the accession of Lord John Russell as prime minister on June 29, 1846, and the two volumes already issued bring the story down to the death of Lord Palmerston on October 18, 1865. Such a scale, it will be seen, is great enough to admit much detail and form a fairly comprehensive treatment of even this full period. The plan of the work is stated by Mr. Paul in his introduction with characteristic vigor. Following Lord Ellenborough's saying, he declares for chronological order. "History", ran Freeman's famous dictum, "is past politics". "History", Mr. Paul tacitly retorts in these volumes, "is past news", and news is of course chronological. More than a quarter of a century ago the author of the *History of England since the Conclusion of the Great War in 1815* wrote that, by taking up his work in the topical or logical order, he at least avoided the criticism that he had adopted the easier method. That criticism the present author is not only prepared to face, but in a measure courts. Paragraphs follow each other in a rapid succession of likes or of contrasts, with the result that from time to time the history thus written passes before us not unlike that journalistic panorama called Notes of the Day, in which human ingenuity strains to find some connecting link between the apparently irreconcilable contents of succeeding paragraphs. One instance will suffice. The author is describing the events of Parliament in 1852 (I, 265). "Protection", concludes the paragraph, "was not merely dead. It was buried." And the following paragraph begins, "So was the French Republic", whence ensues a discussion of the assumption of the imperial title by Napoleon III. Such abrupt transition as this somewhat extreme case is not seldom disconcerting, yet whether from Mr. Paul's cleverness, from our own newspaper-reading habits, or from the very nearness of events precluding philosophy and to some extent perspective, the general result is by no means displeasing, and there comes in time, after the first strangeness has worn off, a certain tendency to pity, then endure, and perhaps, after five volumes, to embrace. The style does much to reconcile one to this. This is history written by a journalist, and it partakes, in consequence, of the merits and defects which go to make up the intellectual equipment of that profession. And whatever drawbacks one may remark in the demands of a vocation which by its very nature precludes many qualities useful to an historian — impartial judgment, or statement of facts and positions without judgments, leisurely and deliberate consideration of cause and effect, the insight which comes from long consideration — we may not deny to journalism its great virtues. Mr. Paul's book exhibits these in a high degree. It is clear, vigorous, and direct. Its movement is rapid, its interest seldom lags. It is preëminently readable, and, as a natural corollary, highly entertaining.

As to the content of the book, politics naturally bulks large in these pages, and the House of Commons fills the foreground. On the other hand, much attention is given to the church, and an unusual amount to the law. There are, as well, chapters on art, literature, and science.

The material progress of the country is, on the whole, kept in the background, and we are not deafened by the clang of machinery nor bewildered by an array of statistics; perhaps, in view of the importance of such things to-day, not enough is said of these matters. The reason advanced for such omission is that the things which are seen are temporal, but the things which are not seen are eternal. This is clever enough, but it scarcely applies to many things found in the ensuing pages. Party struggle and Commons divisions, even legislation itself, form inadequate basis for such a defense, beside general social and economic change.

There is no time here to discuss the great question as to whether or not the historian should be a judge. In any event Mr. Paul decides that for himself and us with directness and force, and it is on that side of his book that the greatest criticism is likely to arise. He pronounces at the outset for judgment and opinion. "Perfect impartiality", he admits, "implies omniscience, and is not human but divine. To extenuate nothing, to set down nought in malice, to consider always the actions of men from their own point of view before passing judgment upon them, and not to expect from fallible mortals a fore-knowledge of things, is the elementary duty of the historian" (p. 21). The historian, moreover, he says, must have his opinions like other people, and it is his duty to express them. These are brave words, and such an ideal carried to perfection would do much to produce great work. Yet there lies in them a danger, which Mr. Paul has not been able wholly to avoid. Where opinions are based on exhaustive study and intimate knowledge they are of great value. But in such a work as this, which contains a multitude of opinions on a multitude of men and matters, it is inevitable that many cannot be based on that first-hand knowledge which alone gives weight. Mr. Paul disclaims omniscience, and it would be unfair to judge all of his clever instantaneous photographs and thumb-nail sketches by the standards of historical portraiture. Many are obviously incomplete, but they are enough; they illustrate the text. On the whole, however one's own opinions of the characters and events on which Mr. Paul passes judgment must differ in individual cases from his, those opinions on English men and affairs seem generally well-informed and fair. Here he has the advantage of that great body of knowledge and tradition which is the heritage of every well-informed Englishman, and his political views, which would appear from his pages to be those of an imperialist free-trader, give him a foot in each of the older camps. But where one passes from the safe haven of English politics into the strange lands, the same cannot be said. Deprived of his former support and in unfamiliar and often unfriendly fields, with insufficient bases for judgment, his opinions and especially his estimates of character are often improbable, not infrequently absurd. Here his judgments seem to argue too often a hasty and imperfect knowledge of the facts, a conclusion borne out here and there by the number and the character of the works cited as references, upon which presumably those opinions are in some sort based. Two instances which perhaps best illustrate these are those

which will doubtless be seized upon by even the most casual reader — the character of Napoleon III and that of Jefferson Davis. One might almost have believed the ogre extinct in the world of historical writing since Macaulay's Tyrconnel, were it not for the portrait of Napoleon III here set forth by Mr. Paul. In his hands that monarch becomes a composite of his great uncle's bogey, a midnight conspirator, and Hugo's Napoleon the Little. Many phrases bear this out; one, in which we are told of the prince consort that "he saw through the superficial qualities of the French Emperor to the hollow and treacherous depths below" (II, 313), will suffice. The character and the acts of Napoleon III may perhaps deserve much censure, yet such phrases do little to explain or illuminate that character, and still less to make clear to the reader the causes and circumstances which allowed this monster to become the head of a great nation. Nor does his characterization of the president of the Confederacy as "a man of no account" and a "puppet chief" (II, 297. 341), besides its absurdity, do more than confuse us, as in the case of Napoleon III, as to the situation and motives of a community which raised him to the highest place in government. It is, in short, more than the damning of an individual, it is in each case the indictment of a people. Such methods add neither to our knowledge nor, still less, to our understanding of great movements. This, as has been said, will probably remain the most serious criticism of a book in most other ways excellent. Such work as that of Mr. Paul may not be judged by the standards of final and definitive statement. Years which bring not alone the philosophical mind, but the necessary information, as yet buried in archives and letter-books and diaries, must elapse before we can come to that maturer judgment we call historical.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

A History of England. By the Rev. J. FRANCK BRIGHT, D.D.
Period V. *Imperial Reaction, Victoria, 1880-1901.* (New
York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1904. Pp. xv, 295.)

AFTER an interval of many years since its inception, the final volume in that history of England which has long found favor as the best of its compass finally appears, bringing the story down almost to the present time. The qualities of the earlier volumes are here still apparent. A certain plainness, almost austerity of style; a directness of narrative; few excursions and those never dictated by a search for the picturesque; a reliance on the subject rather than on style or ornament to sustain the interest; a great body of information clearly arranged; and impartiality of statement and reserve of judgment have been common to the preceding volumes. But as the narrative now approaches completion, as many of the characters depicted still live, and many events are still in suspense, such traits as described come into more and more prominent relief. An author treating of a transition stage between politics and history must needs remember the warning given long ago by Sir Walter Raleigh, that

he who aspires to write contemporary history must be careful of treading too close on the heels of Truth, lest his front teeth be kicked out. Such caution might be well urged upon many now engaged in similar pursuits, but in the present case it would be at least superfluous. The difficulties of the situation are not only apparent to the author, but the responsibility seems almost to weigh upon him. Here is none of that sureness and decision which make for brilliant writing and oblivion. "It is scarcely possible", says Mr. Bright in his preface (p. 6), "to dignify these concluding chapters, or probably any narration of contemporary events and opinions, with the title of history. The passage of years is necessary to winnow the wheat from the chaff, to distinguish in the midst of the chaotic confusion of authorities and memories the points which are of real historic value. The writer wades hopelessly amid the flood of Blue-books, reports, newspaper articles, magazines, and political speeches. He is further hampered by his own recollections, and in danger of regarding as all-important the ephemeral quarrels of party which have filled the world with their clamour to the exclusion of the weightier principles that underlay them. The most that he can hope to achieve with any chance of success is to give such a consecutive and simple narrative of the facts, grouped as far as possible around certain leading lines of thought, as shall render them intelligible and assist the memory in retaining them." The subtitle of his book, *Imperial Reaction*, indicates the author's general characterization of these twenty-one years. The grouping of movements within those years Mr. Bright classifies as the Irish question, the reconstruction of parties, a Conservative legislation infused with Liberal ideas, a temperate but imperial foreign policy, and an unprecedented advance in the importance of the colonies.

The narrative which follows is plain, straightforward, and as impartial as could well be. Its length, 280 pages, is, indeed, somewhat disproportionate to the period covered as compared with the preceding volumes of the series, but the extreme complexity of the questions involved, the mass of material to be digested, and the nearness of the perspective make this more or less unavoidable. The lack of controversy, the suppression of personalities, and the moderation of opinion throughout, even in such absorbing matters of debate as the Irish question and the Boer war, are remarkable. To some the volumes will thus appear tame, to others it will be as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land of barren dispute. It is above all eminently usable, stating arguments with precision and impartiality. These qualities of the narrative, a good index, and seven maps, all of the contested spheres at the extremities of empire in Asia and Africa, make it useful for reference. And, finally, not the least important and perhaps the most purely interesting part of the volume lies in the conclusion, the "Signs of reaction", which the author notes as the prevailing tone of the times. These signs he finds in "ambition and the love of rule, belief in extended empire, in restricted and selfish commerce, in the superiority of a military life, in the value and importance of the privileged classes, and the substitution of sym-

bolism for higher spiritual creeds" (p. 273), a catalogue common enough in the eighteenth century but which nineteenth-century Liberalism fondly hoped had vanished never to return. Expressing themselves in desire for increased territory, in the increasing importance of the lords, in the growth of the High-church movement, in the love of amusement and the desertion of country for town life, in the recrudescence of military spirit, these tendencies among Englishmen are at once striking and to a sincere Liberal ominous. Little less important is the new place of England among the nations, her commercial supremacy threatened by Germany and America, and the coincident movements toward greater self-government among the colonies and that looking toward imperial federation. Written three years later, the author could have found in the crusade for protection a new confirmation for his conclusion, and perhaps in the apparent apathy over that crusade some consolation. In any event these closing pages supply matter for thought which fittingly sums up the excellent résumé which precedes.

WILBUR C. ABBOTT.

Historical Manuscripts Commission: Report on the Manuscripts of Mrs. Stopford-Sackville, of Drayton House, Northamptonshire, Volume I. (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1904. Pp. viii, 439.)

Report on Manuscripts in Various Collections, Volume III. The Manuscripts of T. B. Clarke-Thornhill, Esq., Sir T. Barrett-Lennard, Bart., Pelham R. Papillon, Esq., and W. Cleverly Alexander, Esq. (1904. Pp. lxxvii, 281, ix.)

Sixteenth Report of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. (1904. Pp. 173.)

THE *Report on the Stopford-Sackville Manuscripts* differs from the other reports in the series in that it is a reprint of an earlier volume, with the addition of much new matter. The commission began its work in 1869, when it was deputed to ascertain what unpublished manuscripts were extant which would throw light upon the civil, ecclesiastical, literary, or scientific history of Great Britain. Its first report was published in 1870; and, including the reprint of the Stopford-Sackville manuscripts, it has now published sixteen reports, which are contained in 111 volumes. From 1870 until 1884 the reports were issued in foolscap size; and in all seventeen volumes were published in this form. Since 1884, beginning with the *Calendar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury*, the volumes have been issued in the more convenient octavo size, and have been printed in larger type. The earlier report on the Stopford-Sackville papers—which will form two volumes in the present octavo edition—was the last in the foolscap size; and it is a good indication of the value which has long been placed on the reports that the commission has reprinted the Stopford-Sackville report, for the commis-

sion is by no means in sight of the end of the enormous task which was committed to it in 1869.

Out of the 111 volumes which have been published, only eight are now out of print; and all the reports published since 1885 are now obtainable from the king's printers. It is evidently the intention of the commissioners to reprint the earlier reports which were issued in foolscap, and also to reprint all reports which are not now in print; so that in a few years it will be possible to obtain all the reports in a uniform edition; and dealers in second-hand books will no longer be able to mark any of the reports in their catalogues "out of print and scarce". This should be welcome news to American libraries and to American students; for all the reports are published at cost, at prices seldom exceeding half a crown a volume; and while some of them are exclusively devoted to the municipal history of England, Ireland, and Scotland, and to continental politics of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a large number of them are full of material relating to the history of America and Canada, much of which cannot be obtained from any other source.

Another satisfactory feature about these reprints—certainly about this reprint of the Stopford-Sackville papers—is that it is much more than a reprint. All the manuscripts at Drayton Hall were reexamined by the late Mr. R. B. Knowles, one of the subcommissioners, who was at work upon them at the time of his death. The completion of the report was then put in the hands of Mr. W. O. Hewlett; in this way much was added to the report. This revision preparatory to reprinting will be commended by many students who in using the reports have often come on an abstract of a letter or document of which they would like to have a more extended summary, if not a reprint in full. The reissue of these earlier reports, and the labor and care which is being given to these reissues, show that the royal commissioners fully realize that the great work they are superintending is of wide and increasing value; and that they understand that, in some of the earlier reports on collections of manuscripts, omissions were a little too frequent, and that at times the plan of calendaring the manuscripts was carried a little too far. So far as the printing is concerned, the reports are paying their way through the press; as editions increase in number, they are probably doing more; and as for the cost of examining the manuscripts, copying them, and otherwise preparing them for the printer, that can be but a small charge on a wealthy nation like Great Britain, in view of the unique and permanent value of the work accomplished.

Families and institutions possessing manuscripts have from the first, and increasingly as time has gone on, welcomed the visits of the subcommissioners to their muniment-rooms, just as students who have learned to value the reports welcome each new volume. Long ago the subcommissioners secured the good-will and confidence of the owners of private collections of manuscripts; so much so that the duke of Rutland, the duke of Portland, the late marquis of Salisbury, the earl of Bath, and

the earl of Lonsdale, to name only a few, allowed their papers to be removed from their muniment-rooms to the Record Office in London, so as to facilitate the preparation of the commission reports. Scotch and Irish noblemen and gentlemen acted in a similar manner, and permitted the temporary removal of their treasures to the Record Office in Edinburgh or to that in Dublin.

The death of the late Queen Victoria made it necessary that King Edward VII should ratify and confirm the commission under which the work of publishing the manuscripts was being done. At the time of this ratification fourteen additional royal commissioners were named. It is to be regretted that at this time, when the work of the commission was before the cabinet and the king, opportunity was not taken to extend the scope of the work, and to empower the commission to examine and publish letters and documents throwing light on the industrial history of Great Britain. The terms of the reference confine the work to subjects connected with the civil, ecclesiastical, literary, or scientific history of Great Britain. The term "scientific" may be extended so as to embrace many phases of industry; but the commissioners, up to the present time, have not so regarded it. There is much matter of importance for industrial history, particularly in the Irish papers. It is not wanting as regards Ireland in the present volume. But the commission reports, so far as they have gone, have not thrown much light on the beginnings of the woolen, the cotton, or the iron industry in England, or on the coming of the factory stages in these industries. England is a country of industrial firms of long standing, and of families which for generations have been in the same line of industry. All over the country there are industrial concerns which have been in the same families for a hundred or a hundred and fifty years. These families have their muniment-rooms; and so long as trade secrets are not divulged, they would welcome visits from the subcommissioners of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Most students of English history are familiar with the Stopford-Sackville report of 1884; for the manuscripts at Drayton Hall are about the most varied and the most valuable that have been reported on by the commission. As a reprint the present volume does not call for extended notice. It may, however, be well to remind students of the Revolutionary period who have come into this field in recent years that it contains a valuable series of letters which passed between Lord George Germain and General Sir John Irwin in the years 1761 to 1784; and as both Lord George and General Irwin were of the House of Commons, there are many side-lights on the attitude of ministers and Parliament at the time of the American revolt. The Irish papers are numerous and important. Those which embrace the correspondence between the earl of Buckinghamshire, who was lord-lieutenant from 1777 to 1780, are unusually interesting, especially to students who are concerned with the extent to which the American Revolution affected the political, ecclesiastical, and fiscal systems of Great Britain and Ireland. The second volume of the

Stopford-Sackville report, which is now about due from the press, will be devoted to India, America, and Canada ; and most of the fresh material is promised in this American volume.

The most numerous and most valuable manuscripts in the second of these three volumes are those of Mr. Clarke-Thornhill. They are interesting in themselves, and interesting also on account of their history and the way in which they were brought to light. They were discovered at Rushton Hall, in Leicestershire, in 1828, when in the demolition of a thick partition wall the workmen broke into a large recess in which they found an enormous bundle containing manuscripts and theological books. The manuscripts begin in 1576 and go to November, 1605. In that month they come to an end ; and from the contents of the bundle and from the history of the former owners of Rushton Hall there is good ground for believing that they were deposited in the recess and walled up in the alarm which followed the Gunpowder Plot.

In Tudor and Stuart times Rushton Hall was a seat of the Tresham family. They were steadfast adherents of the old faith ; and in the reign of Elizabeth the head of the family, Sir Thomas Tresham, suffered much for his prominence among the few aristocratic families that remained loyal to the Roman Catholic church. Some members of his family had knowledge of the Gunpowder Plot, if they were not actually concerned in it. Francis Tresham, Sir Thomas Tresham's son, was arrested for his part in it ; and it is supposed that the Tresham manuscripts were walled up at Rushton Hall when there was an apprehension that search would be made there for documents which would establish his complicity in the plot. Possibly the search was made ; but the precautions which had been taken served their purpose, and when the manuscripts were found they had every appearance of having lain undisturbed in their hiding-place for two hundred years. They had been little injured by damp. In this report of the Historical Manuscripts Commission they are reproduced almost in their entirety, with an introduction of fifty-seven pages by Mrs. S. C. Lomas, who prepared the documents for the press. They rank among the most important private documents touching on the Reformation in England which have been reported upon by the Commission ; and in particular they show what it cost in actual suffering and loss for a territorial family in the reign of Elizabeth to maintain its adherence to the old faith.

Between 1581 and 1599 Sir Thomas Tresham was continually in and out of prison. For a long time he paid a monthly fine of £20 as a recusant ; and when he was out of prison he was compelled to find heavy bonds for his good behavior, and oftentimes to secure a license from the bishop before he moved from one place to another about his ordinary affairs. Neither imprisonment nor fines nor the arguments of the learned theologians who visited the recusants in jail served to shake his loyalty to his church ; and there is no proof that Sir Thomas was disloyal to either Queen Elizabeth or King James.

Under the plan adopted for publishing the manuscripts reported on by the commission many volumes are included in one report. For instance, until the sixteenth report was published this year, the last report was that of 1899, in which were included no fewer than forty volumes, beginning with the Dartmouth papers, published in 1896, and ending with the calendar of the Stuart manuscripts at Windsor Castle, only partly issued as yet. It is only in the reports that the royal commissioners note the progress of their work and the changes in the personnel of the commissioners and in the staff of examiners and compilers. In the last report, the sixteenth, these changes are recorded, and there is a complete list of all the collections of manuscripts which have been reported on since the commission was organized. The list occupies twenty-nine pages, with an average of forty-three entries to a page. From a perusal of these pages a student can learn at once the nature of the contents of the 111 volumes published between 1870 and 1904. There is also a second list in which the collections reported on are topographically arranged. For England this list is arranged according to counties; but there are no county subdivisions for Scotland and Ireland. Accompanying these two lists there is a list of the volumes of the reports as they have been issued from the press. The table of contents of each volume is given, with the price at which it is published; and mention is made of the volumes that are out of print. This last report is published at 9d.; and students who have not easy access to the 111 volumes will find it of much service, for it contains the most comprehensive account yet issued in any form of the enormous amount of work which the royal commission and its staff of trained and expert examiners and compilers have accomplished.

EDWARD PORRITT.

A School History of England, by Harmon B. Niver (New York, American Book Company, 1904, pp. 406, xvi), is intended for use in the higher grades in the elementary schools. The introduction of numerous classic anecdotes, of extracts from standard historical poems and of vivid bits from the sources, together with the simplicity of the style, seem to make the work suitable for its purpose. The repetition of discarded errors and the method of treating the more subtle and complicated problems indicate that the author is not a specialist. The bibliography is meager and bizarre, and one frequently wonders whether the best choice has been made in the case of particular references. On the other hand, the questions are stimulating, and the general tone of the book is sensible and pleasing.

The Domesday Boroughs, by Adolphus Ballard (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Henry Frowde, 1904, pp. vi, 135), fills a large gap in the literature of English municipal history. Thanks to Mr. Ballard's efforts, we now have an excellent survey of all the material relating to boroughs in Domesday Book; and in an appendix he also gives a succinct statement of the main facts concerning the Anglo-Saxon boroughs. About one-quarter of his monograph is an expansion of the evidence in

support of Maitland's discovery that many rural magnates were bound to perform the duty of fortifying the boroughs, and that they did this by keeping in those boroughs houses which were regarded as appurtenances of their rural estates. Mr. Ballard is unwilling, however, to accept the whole of Maitland's theory, for he says little concerning the garrison duty of the burgesses. He believes that their main function was *burhbot*, the repair of the town-walls, which they undertook on behalf of their lords, the owners of the rural properties. To prove this he relies mainly upon the Domesday entries concerning Oxford; and the evidence which he presents regarding Chester and Rochester (p. 35) seems to conflict with his general conclusion. He is also inclined to reject Maitland's doctrine that the borough-court was originally established to keep the peace between the warriors who garrisoned the town. He believes that the burghmote did not exclude the hundred court, because, according to a law of Edgar, the former was to be held only thrice a year, but he overlooks the phrase "unless there be need oftener" in the corresponding doom of Cnut (II, c. 18). In fact, he belittles the activity of this tribunal and does not try to explain its functions or *raison d'être*. He intimates his willingness to accept Maitland's garrison theory "with a slight modification" (p. 35); but that theory ascribes importance to the borough-court, which kept the special royal peace conferred on fortified places.

Mr. Ballard distinguishes "the composite borough" with tenurial heterogeneity from "the simple borough" with tenurial homogeneity: in the former other lords besides the king hold houses and have rights of superiority over the burgesses, while the latter forms part of the estate of a single lord, and all the burgesses are his men. He gives a full and scholarly account of the organization of both types. Errors of detail are not numerous. There are some lapses in proof-reading: p. 4, n. 1, "Places" for Districts; p. 112, n. 2, "Manderitte" for Mandeville; p. 119, n. 1, "Hawker's" for Hawkins. It is not safe to say that Henry I ordered the burghmote to be held twice a year because this enactment occurs in the so-called *Leges Henrici Primi* (p. 121). Mr. Ballard would have had less difficulty in identifying the "lawmen" at Lincoln and Stamford with the "judges" at York and Chester (p. 53) if he had known the passage relating to York in the *Visitations of Southwell* (p. 192): "hereditario jure lagaman civitatis, quod Latine potest dici legis lator vel judex". Probably a diligent search of the available records of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries would throw some gleams of light on the earlier period. Despite minor defects, we are thankful, however, for this useful addition to Domesday literature.

CHARLES GROSS.

The Office of Justice of the Peace in England in its Origin and Development. By Charles Austin Beard, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, Volume XX, Number 1.] (New York, The Macmillan Company, Columbia University Press,

1904, pp. 184.) The history of the peace magistracy of England is a subject of considerable interest; in the words of Coke, "it is such a form of subordinate government for the tranquility and quiet of the realm as no part of the Christian world hath the like". Mr. Beard traces its development to the accession of James I, devoting especial attention to the Tudor period, though he does not neglect the middle ages. In his preface he says: "The county records now in existence, so far as I have been able to discover by personal research and correspondence, do not extend beyond the reign of Elizabeth, and the documents of that time are few and fragmentary." With more research he would have discovered that there are sessional rolls of Essex for the reign of Philip and Mary, and that many Elizabethan rolls of Essex and other counties are extant. His knowledge of the sources and literature of his subject might easily have been augmented. He does not mention Howard's *Peace Magistracy*, and exhibits no acquaintance with the printed extracts from the Quarter Sessions Rolls of the counties of Middlesex, Derby, Essex, York, and Worcester, the exploitation of which should have enabled him to penetrate more deeply into his subject; these rolls might throw light, for example, on the "justices at work", and on the important office of the clerk of the peace. So too in his meager account of the borough justices (pp. 148-150) he relies on Merewether and Stephens "in the absence of a better authority", when he could have found valuable material in works like Nathaniel Bacon's *Annals of Ipswich* and W. H. Stevenson's *Records of Nottingham*. A more careful study of this topic would lead him to modify his statement that "the general practice of establishing municipal magistrates by charter may be said to have begun with Henry VI." (pp. 148-149). A minor fault is the omission of information regarding the editions of works cited in the foot-notes — for example, those of Lambard, Reeves, Gneist, Cunningham, and Pollock and Maitland. A list of authorities might also have explained the meaning of "Rymer, O.", and might have indicated more clearly which of Prynne's two hundred books and pamphlets is referred to on page 31, under the title "Prynne, *Institutes*." A work which gives "about one hundred references to the Close and Patent Rolls concerning the conservators [of the peace] before Edward III." should be cited with more care. Mr. Beard's book contains a fuller account of the early history of the peace magistracy of England than will be found elsewhere, but his researches have not yielded new general conclusions of much importance.

CHARLES GROSS.

Les Sources de l'Histoire de France des Origines aux Guerres d'Italie (1494). Par Auguste Molinier. IV. *Les Valois, 1328-1461*. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1904, pp. 354, 12.) The fourth volume of this important series involves complexities from which its predecessors have been relatively free. The thirteenth century saw the end of the long period of intensive development of the French monarchy begun un-

der Louis VI and continued until the reign of Philip IV. The Hundred Years' War, the conflicts of the papal government at Avignon with the English kings and Ludwig IV of Bavaria, the war of succession in Castile, in which France and England participated, the Italian ambitions of Louis d'Orléans and the Duke of Anjou — all of these facts and forces combined to complicate French politics. In consequence, the historical bibliographer is led far afield in his investigations. It is the minimum of praise to say that M. Molinier has overcome these difficulties most admirably. The English and American scholar will note the omission of the fact that the translation of Froissart by Sir John Bourchier (Berners) was reprinted in London in 1812 and lately again in the series of Tudor translations.

J. W. T.

The Sons of the Clergy, 1655-1904. By E. H. Pearce, one of the court of assistants. (London, John Murray, 1904, pp. xi, 298). Macaulay and Green would have found good and frequent use for this monograph had it been in existence when they were at work on their histories. In its pages Macaulay would have discovered additional material to justify his description and estimate of the social and intellectual condition of the clergy in the seventeenth century; for then and much later many of the clergy were so poor that they were glad to accept help from the Sons of the Clergy — the oldest charitable society in England — in apprenticing their boys with printers, tailors, and blacksmiths and other handicraftsmen, and in extricating themselves from difficulties which seem inevitable in the case of English clergy with small stipends and large families. Green would have drawn upon the first-hand material of this book for the economic as well as the social and religious chapters of his *History of the English People*. The two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the society was celebrated at St. Paul's cathedral on the second of May last. Mr. Pearce's history of the institution was written for this anniversary; and the book no doubt owes its introduction to a constituency wider than the friends of the society to the fact that Mr. John Murray, the publisher, is of the court of assistants. However this may be, it is well that a wider constituency was sought, because Mr. Pearce's book shows that it is possible to make the letter-books and minute-books of a great charitable organization of popular interest and also of real value to students of social and institutional history.

E. P.

Mr. Osmund Airy tells us in the preface of his *Charles II* (London and New York, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1904, pp. ix, 416) that his principal business is with Charles himself, and that he has treated the history of his time and the men and women who surrounded him, only in so far as they throw light on the character of Charles. Judged from this standpoint, and keeping in mind the limitations which Mr. Airy has strictly observed, it must be acknowledged that there is little to add to this monograph. It is unlikely that there will arise any

defender of Charles II, who will attempt to rehabilitate his character. If any such should appear, he will find his task exceedingly difficult in face of the calm, almost cold-blooded analytical dissection to which Mr. Airy has subjected the gay monarch. Whether the author is equally as successful in tracing the causes of Charles's depravity as in bringing out the colossal selfishness and duplicity of the king is open to question. It may seem fantastic even to the adherents of the theory of heredity, and to the firm believers in atavism, to trace the Oriental licentiousness that characterized Charles II to so distant an ancestor as Henry of Navarre; and Mr. Airy surely lays too much stress on the influence of the earl of Berkshire, who was Charles's governor for only a few years after 1642. This, however, is a minor point; and the author well brings out the immense influence which Charles exercised upon London and English society at the time of the Restoration. The present edition is a reprint of a finely illustrated volume published by Goupil in 1901.

A. G. P.

Die ersten Deutschen am unteren Mississippi und die Creolen deutscher Abstammung. By J. Hanno Deiler. (New Orleans, the author, 1904, pp. 32.) Professor Deiler of Tulane University has made his name favorably known by a considerable series of pamphlets devoted to the history of the Germans in the United States, and especially in Louisiana. The present pamphlet is one of the most interesting of these. After a glance at the German Hans who accompanied La Salle in 1684 and avenged his murder, he takes up in minute detail the history of the German immigration into Louisiana during the period while the colony was under control of John Law and his company. After careful researches Professor Deiler fixes upon 3,000 as the probable number of the Germans who landed in Louisiana during the period of Law's régime. He points out the inaccuracy, in respect to this episode, of French's translation of Penicaut's "Relation", and follows down through the eighteenth century the history of the German immigrants into Louisiana, especially in the parishes of St. Charles and St. John the Baptist. He exhibits in an interesting manner, and with tabulated examples, how this large element in the population, Creoles of German descent, became concealed through striking perversions of their patronymics into names more or less resembling names which might be found in French. The pamphlet has interesting maps and illustrations and is, in its limited field, of genuine historical importance.

Volumes III and IV of the *Ecclesiastical Records of the State of New York*, published by the state under the supervision of Hugh Hastings, state historian (Albany, James B. Lyon Company, State Printers, 1902, pp. xl, 1443-2308; lix, 2309-3146), cover the period from 1701 to 1750. Like their two predecessors, noticed in some detail in the REVIEW (VIII, 551-553), these volumes contain considerable hitherto unpublished material relating to the history of the Dutch Reformed Church

in New York. On the other hand, the matter relating to the other religious bodies consists almost solely of extracts from printed and easily accessible works. An interesting exception, however, is "An Account of the Present Condition of the Protestants in the Palatinate", 1699 (III, 1453-1459), one of several pamphlets relating to the Palatines reprinted from copies of the originals in the British Museum secured by Reverend William J. Hinke of Philadelphia.

A. L. C.

The Youth of Washington, told in the Form of an Autobiography, by S. Weir Mitchell (New York, The Century Company, 1904, pp. 290), may be judged as history or as fiction, according to the taste of the reader, and possesses high merit in either aspect. It deserves consideration as a serious attempt to reconstruct the character of Washington, to portray the life in which he lived to the close of the old French war. There is just enough of fact woven into the story to give a true foundation, and the deft touch of a master of story has given life to details that must be sought in scattered records of colonial life in Virginia. The charm of style will cause the book to be read by many to whom a more serious attempt would be distasteful, and few readers will appreciate how closely Dr. Mitchell has followed his authorities, or how extensive were the studies required. In this he has followed the example of Thackeray, whose notes for his unfinished *Denis Duval* proved his care for truth in his fictitious characters. The words put by Dr. Mitchell into the mouths of Tilghman, Hamilton, and others may be paraphrases of actual letters; the chats with Lord Fairfax probably rest upon tradition or the writer's imagination; the use of historical names, sometimes thinly disguised under initials (as was customary in that day), afford a touch of reality to the story; and the summaries of diaries and extracts from letters, based as they are upon actual records, make good historical reading. It would be possible to criticize some of Dr. Mitchell's statements, and the conception of Washington's mother is too harsh and even contradictory in detail to be either true or pleasing. We think, too, that the writer errs in saying that Washington's features and body were those of his father, for a descendant of the Balls long prided himself on his striking resemblance to the General, and on slight provocation would exhibit himself in Continental uniform to prove that resemblance. Of course, Washington would never have written such an autobiography, for it was not in him to do it. We have here much of the real Washington, with such additional accessories as a literary artist thought necessary to complete a picture. The difference between Washington in a reminiscent mood and Dr. Mitchell in his literary venture may be seen by comparing the account of the Braddock campaign which Washington drew up, now in the Pickering family, and the story of the same campaign as told in this volume. It is no adverse criticism to say that the former is the true Washington, while the latter is much more readable.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

Burnaby's Travels through North America. Reprinted from the third edition of 1798, with introduction and notes by Rufus Rockwell Wilson. (New York, A. Wessels Company, 1904, pp. 265.) A real service has been rendered in including this mine of information in the "Source Books of American History". The last edition dating from 1798, the work has long been too rare to be easily accessible. This has been a distinct misfortune inasmuch as the narrative of the honest and observing Englishman, describing social, economic, and political conditions from Virginia to Massachusetts in the years 1759-1760 has always been a valued and trustworthy source. Mr. Wilson has, as editor, done little more than lend his name to the volume. An introduction of two pages gives a brief sketch of Burnaby's career and states how the *Travels* came to be printed. In twenty notes, filling nine pages, he includes biographical accounts of individuals mentioned in the volume, and brief descriptions of some of the places and buildings. Of critical notes there are none, which seems unfortunate. Especially might some attention have been paid to the estimates of population in the various colonies, the more so since Mr. Dexter has brought together all the material that would have been required. The form of the book is, however, very attractive, and the narrative was well worth reprinting even without editorial annotations.

Mr. Edward Bicknell's *The Territorial Acquisitions of the United States, 1787-1904* (Boston, Small, Maynard, and Company, 1904, pp. xii, 144), is a clear and concise statement of the superficial facts concerning our accessions of territory. It contains a few errors, such as the statements that France had no trouble in securing the retrocession of Louisiana, that the right of deposit was suspended through French influence, and that Spain thought the money worth more than Florida, but for the most part the text is accurate as far as it goes. The style is too colloquial, but as a whole the book is better than many more pretentious ones. A good deal might be said of the inaccuracy of the statistical appendixes in all the books of this class. We note only that the present one gives an old estimate of the area of the state of Florida as the area of the Florida purchase, although stating at the same time that the purchase included parts of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana.

F. H. H.

Influence of the Breton Deputation and the Breton Club in the French Revolution (April-October, 1789). By Charles Kuhlmann. [Nebraska University Studies, Volume II, No. 4.] (Lincoln, Nebraska, Jacob North and Company, 1903, pp. 92.) This monograph contains the only satisfactory account of the so-called "Breton Club" that has yet been published. The chapter devoted to the subject in J. W. Zinkeisen's *Der Jakobiner-Klub* (1852) was based upon the most unsatisfactory evidence, the *mémoires* of the Revolutionary period; the few pages of sources upon the subject in F. A. Aulard's *La Société des Jacobins* (1889)

contain little but extracts from the *mémoires* used by Zinkeisen. Besides these two works, little of value has been published on this famous club. The most noticeable thing about Dr. Kuhlmann's monograph is the documentation; he has utilized the voluminous correspondence of the Breton deputies with their constituents. Although much of this material has been published and partially exploited in connection with other topics, strangely enough no one had attempted to rewrite the history of the Breton club from the only sources from which it could be written scientifically.

A critical discussion of the evidence upon which the study rests is followed by a chapter treating of the rôle of the Breton deputies in the provincial revolution in Bretagne. This preliminary study makes intelligible the part played by the deputies in the assembly at Versailles; it brings out the facts that the club was the natural continuation of provincial gatherings of a similar character, and that the hostility to the nobility of the deputies from Bretagne was due to the bitter civil war that had broken out in the province previous to the meeting of the States-General. A brief chapter disposes of the Breton Club, which was never so called in the correspondence of the deputies and which was never anything more than a series of irregular gatherings with the Breton delegation as a nucleus. The larger part of the monograph deals with the influence of the Breton deputies in the National Assembly from April to October, 1789.

FRED MORROW FLING.

Le Clergé et le Culte Catholique en Bretagne pendant la Révolution. District de Dol. Documents inédits. (Rennes, Plihon et Hommay, 1903, pp. iv, 365.) This is a collection of documents edited by P. Delarue showing the experience in applying the Revolutionary régime in Bretagne so far as it related to the church. These documents not only furnish us with detailed information on the conflict between the Revolution and the church in a very limited area, but serve at the same time to illustrate the struggle throughout the whole of Bretagne. The volume, the result of very conscientious work, is a useful contribution to the great undertaking in France looking toward the writing of a complete series of local histories as a basis for a more reliable general history after 1789. This is the first part, and covers Antrain, Bazouges-la-Pérouse, and Sens; four more volumes are to complete the collection for the district of Dol.

CHARLES KUHLMANN.

Correspondance de Le Coz, Évêque Constitutionnel d'Ille-et-Vilaine et Archevêque de Besançon. Publiée pour la Société d'Histoire Contemporaine par le P. Roussel, de l'Oratoire. Tome II. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1903, pp. xv, 521.) This correspondence is a selection chiefly from Le Coz's letter-books. Volume I, covering the years 1791 to 1801 when Le Coz was bishop of Ille-et-Vilaine, appeared in 1900. The notice of it (*AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, VI, 133-134) sketches concisely the prelate's life. Under the Concordat he was elevated to the

archdiocese of Besançon, and the present volume covers his occupancy of that post from 1802 to his death in May, 1815. Le Coz's duties were heavy from the nature and mere size of his diocese. It covered three departments and was partly mountainous. He faced also the task of conciliating his clergy. A third of them were, like himself, *assermentés*. The rest were *insermentés* who, rather than take the oath of submission to the civil constitution of the church, had gone, many of them, into exile. These, now returning, said openly that they had not come from the depths of Germany to recognize Le Coz's authority. To them he seemed in fact less an archbishop than an arch-heretic, and the height of feeling in corresponding circles of the laity may be judged when a general officer at Vesoul inquired publicly of Le Coz concerning the health of the archbishop's wife and children. The affront presumably was groundless. This opposition and Le Coz's success in dealing with it are a prominent feature of this volume. The question bulks largely in the letters of 1802 and 1803, which form nearly a third of the total.

The leanest years in the correspondence are 1806 and 1810 to 1812. In 1814, when the allies invaded France, the correspondence swells both in bulk and in interest. Le Coz shared in the defense of Besançon. Apparently his real sympathies lay with Napoleon. By a coincidence startling enough, Le Coz wrote to Marie-Louise, on the day after Leipzig, that for twenty years it had been impossible not to see the hand of God guiding the career of her imperial consort. Six months later he wrote to the count of Artois, on the occasion of the First Restoration, "The day of the Lord has appeared". By March, 1815, Napoleon again, according to the archbishop, is the choice of heaven. One is tempted to recall the vicar of Bray, perhaps unjustly. Le Coz at times could be outspoken. In 1804 he protested to Napoleon against his implied acceptance of the briefs and rescripts of Pius VI; and to Caprara, cardinal and papal legate in France, he wrote in 1802 that while the church of Christ was founded on eternal truth, for several years recourse had been had for its support to falsehood, imposture, Machiavellism, and all the shameful means which worldly rulers blush to use. Le Coz was a stanch Gallican with large views. He associated intimately with Protestant pastors especially in his diocese, and he discussed plans for the organic reunion of Christian churches. A respect not usually given to *assermentés* is accorded him even by opponents. Among the latter, apparently, is Père Roussel. In his introduction he disclaims sympathy with the ecclesiastical tendencies of Le Coz.

H. M. BOWMAN.

The second volume on "Pioneer Roads" in the series of *Historic Highways*, by Mr. Archer Butler Hulbert (Cleveland, The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1904, pp. 202), is devoted to roadways connecting the Atlantic coast plain with the Ohio valley. One of these is the old Northwestern Turnpike, constructed in 1827, leading from Winchester, Vir-

ginia, to Parkersburg, on the Ohio river. The author considers it the last attempt to construct a highway across the mountains. It was always overshadowed by the parallel Cumberland National Road and was consigned to oblivion by the completion of the Erie Canal and the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad. Another highway described in this volume traversed the state of New York from Fort Schuyler, on the Mohawk, to the Genesee river. It was built about 1796 from the proceeds of the sales of state land and of lotteries. It first opened up the low central portion of the state to traffic and settlement. Another New York highway, the Catskill Turnpike, connecting the Hudson and the Susquehanna, finds a place in the volume by a chapter reproduced from the recent and admirable work of F. W. Halsey, *The Old New York Frontier* (1901). This is quoted entire, "through the kindness of the author". Quotation, indeed, seems characteristic of the volume under review. More than three-fourths of its space is occupied by descriptions of journeys on public highways taken from accounts of travelers. Among the authorities thus levied upon are the journal of Thomas Wallcutt, taken from the *Proceedings of the Massachusetts Historical Society*, 1879; Timothy Bigelow's *Journal of a Tour to Niagara Falls in the Year 1805*; Charles Augustus Murray's *Travels in North America* (London, 1839); and the familiar *American Notes* of Charles Dickens. These are supplemented by several original letters descriptive of journeys across the mountains.

A candid judgment will admit that the volume calls attention to certain connecting links in American highways which are likely to be forgotten, but that it serves small additional purpose. It might be added that a service is performed in collecting under one cover these contemporaneous descriptions of early travel. The local color to be gained from them is obvious and indisputable. Their use in swelling an extended series is likely to be more in question.

E. E. SPARKS.

Lectures on the History of the Nineteenth Century, delivered at the Cambridge University Extension Summer Meeting, August, 1902. Edited by F. A. Kirkpatrick, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge, at the University Press, 1902, pp. viii, 384.) It is not often that a series of university extension lectures is planned on so scholarly a scale as to be available, after their immediate purpose has been served, for a wider audience. Attempts of this character hitherto made have been only moderately successful, because the demands of university extension students do not customarily call forth lectures that can be deemed sufficiently scholarly to warrant their perpetuation in print. The volume under review, however, stands in a class by itself. It consists of lectures on the history of the nineteenth century delivered to university extension students in Cambridge by distinguished scholars, masters of their subjects, and in many instances natives of the countries of which they treat. The exceptions to the latter rule are the lecturers on the United States, Italy, the Ottoman Empire, and the Far East, each of whom is an

Englishman. The same is true of those who treat of general European politics and of international relations. It was, as the following names will show, a rare company of historical writers that the Cambridge committee was able to bring together on this occasion for the benefit of its university extension students.

Of the lectures here printed four at least may lay just claim to the title of genuine contributions to historical literature: those on Russia by Professor Vinogradoff and those by Mr. Gooch and Professor Browne on the Ottoman Empire and Pan-Islamism. Scarcely inferior is that by Mr. Rose on the Continental System, in which the reader familiar with that author's work on Napoleon may find many new points of view. Closely following these are the chapters by M. Mantoux on France, Mr. King on Italy, Professor Marcks on Germany, and Dr. Reich on Austria-Hungary. The dominant note in each of the lectures is high appreciation of the work which the particular country has accomplished for the betterment of its people in the last fifty years.

Possibly the authors are too appreciative of the merits of their respective heroes, and the reader may feel that the last word has not been said upon the life and influence of Mazzini, Bismarck, and Gambetta. Professor Marcks certainly furnishes the text for a chapter of commentary on the moral and intellectual aspects of Bismarck's work when he says that "the nation of poets and thinkers has become a nation of power and business" (p. 96); and Mr. King has gone some distance beyond his estimate of Mazzini, as expressed in his little life of that genius, when he says that he was the greatest of modern Italians. Still, in spite of occasional exaggerations, the tone of the essays is wholesome and the flattery easily discounted.

On a lower level of originality and scholarship may be placed Professor Laughton's lecture on "Britain's Naval Policy". It is written too dogmatically and with too evident an attitude of condescension toward his ignorant hearers. It reads not a little like a Parliamentary speech supporting a naval estimate. On a still lower level are the lectures of Principal Ward, Professor Westlake, and Professor Lawrence on European politics, international relations, and England and the United States. They are good enough in a way, but are devoid of originality or novelty of any kind. Least satisfactory is the lecture of Mr. Hannah on China and Japan, which glides merrily over the surface, closing with the happy but unsuccessfully prophetic word that the Anglo-Japanese alliance, with its ability to command the sea, "constitutes the strongest possible guarantee that in present circumstances could exist of permanent peace" (p. 383). Mr. Hannah disarms criticism by acknowledging the omission of all mention of Russia, but we must insist that a lecture on "Political Problems of the Far East" which says nothing of Russia, Manchuria, and the great question of land supremacy in that part of the world has not fulfilled the promise of its title.

To readers already possessed of some knowledge of the subject we can recommend this book in very high terms, as giving in compact and

lucid form the dominant features of European development. On the other hand, it is not a book that can be recommended to beginners, for the manner of treatment presupposes a reasonable familiarity with the events of the period.

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

Gass's Journal of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, with an introduction by James Kendall Hosmer, LL.D. (Chicago, A. C. McClurg and Company, 1904, pp. liii, 298.) This volume in McClurg's "series of Americana reprints" has justly received considerable attention, for its publication renders once more available the earliest printed narrative of the expedition by means of which the United States made an appraisal of its first territorial bargain. The journal as we have it before us is an exact reprint, including title-page, publisher's preface, notes, and illustrations, of the third American edition of 1811, itself printed without change from the original volume put forth by Zadok Kramer of Pittsburg in 1807. This is not, unfortunately, the original journal kept by the sergeant. That document, now, so far as is known, no longer in existence, was, before publication, placed in the hands of David M'Keehan, schoolmaster, who whipped it into approved rhetorical form as uncereemoniously as though it had been a composition by one of his own backward pupils. Hence Patrick Gass, whose academic career extended over exactly nineteen days, narrates his adventures in painfully correct English, suitably spelled and punctuated. It is to be feared furthermore that the fastidious pedagogue did not confine his editorial labors to the expurgation of grammatical and orthographical blemishes. How many details, perhaps of historical value as well as of human interest, are omitted cannot be known.

Gass's journal was one of eight or nine similar documents kept by members of the expedition, and is one of the five still extant. Until the publication in 1814 of Nicholas Biddle's digest of the Lewis and Clark journals, it was the only printed account of the exploring tour, and, together with these latter, it long remained the only available source of information. Dr. Hosmer has confined his editorial work to supplying an introduction. In some thirty-odd pages he has brought together what is known of the personnel of the expedition, both as regards the part borne by each member and as regards the subsequent career of each. It seems a pity that so good an opportunity to annotate the text should have been passed by. Had the editor been able to enlighten us as to the identity of the nameless heroes of the various adventures narrated by the sergeant, he would have supplied a personal element which is strikingly lacking. Especially would geographical notes and comparisons with other accounts of the expedition have been of value to the student. As it is, the volume contains no new contribution, nor does it make the journal of Gass much more valuable as a source. It does, however, restore it to common use (the last reprint was issued in Dayton, Ohio, 1847) in a most attractive form; and the introduction, in an easy though sometimes rather

personal style, always with a view to the picturesque, is a convenient summary of the results of recent research. The portrait of Gass, from a rare wood-engraving, which serves as a frontispiece, is a distinct addition, but the map of the Lewis and Clark route, promised on the title-page, is, in the reviewer's volume at least, conspicuous by its absence.

Internal Improvements in North Carolina previous to 1860. By Charles Clinton Weaver, Ph.D. [Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science, Series XXI, Nos. 3-4.] (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1903, pp. 95.) This work is of some real interest and value. It deals with an unworked field in southern history. A good deal of interesting and valuable information has been brought together by Dr. Weaver, but that he has used his material in the best and most scientific manner cannot be claimed. While reading his monograph, one is impressed with the largeness of the subject and with the incompleteness of the treatment. The conviction that his work is by no means complete, comprehensive, or fundamental is very strong. In the first part he attempts to explain the general movements for the improvement of the physical bases of the state, tracing out in part the causes and the results of these movements. It is here that Dr. Weaver gives evidence that he does not thoroughly comprehend the situation and that he has not seriously analyzed it. The second part, in which he makes a narrative statement of the companies organized to improve the Cape Fear, Roanoke, Tar, Neuse, and other rivers, and in which he tells of the life and experiences of the companies interested in the canals and early railroads of the state, is of more interest and value than the first part; he presents us with a consecutive statement of the leading facts, though he has not made a fundamental analysis of them. No one can write the history of internal improvements in North Carolina, or in any other section, without knowing the economic history of that section far back into the past. As yet the economic history of North Carolina during the eighteenth century is unknown. Dr. Weaver really begins his study with about 1815. Had he made a study of the economic conditions of the people of North Carolina during the eighteenth century, his treatment of the period covered would have been very different and of far greater value.

CHARLES LEE RAPER.

Under the title *History vs. The Whitman Saved Oregon Story*, Mr. William I. Marshall, principal of the Gladstone School of Chicago, has brought together three of his contributions to the Whitman controversy. (Chicago, Blakely Printing Company, 1904, pp. 92, 221-236.) The first is a review of Mowry's *Whitman*, originally printed in the *Daily Oregonian*, September 3, 1902; the second is an examination of Eells's *Reply to Professor Bourne*, not before printed; and the third is a discussion of Professor Bourne's paper, reprinted from the *Annual Report of the American Historical Association* for 1900. The matter of the three papers is so arranged as to cover the controversy systematically. They

reveal the author's intimate knowledge of Oregon history, and their conclusions are irresistible. Particularly to be noted is the additional evidence indicating that the supposed recollections of Dr. Whitman's visit to Washington really related to Dr. White. Mr. Marshall attacks the subject in the spirit of the crusader and with rather more "vehemence" than the circumstances require. The later sponsors for the Whitman story were very probably deceived in the beginning and in the end deceive themselves. Mr. Marshall cannot understand how any one can cling to preconceived opinions in the face of evidence conclusively disproving them, yet the phenomenon is very common, and results more often from intellectual blindness than from intentional dishonesty. Moreover the correction of misstatements of historical facts is the essential thing, in comparison with which the question of the motives of those who make them is altogether secondary.

F. H. H.

The volume on *Francis Parkman*, which Mr. Henry Dwight Sedgwick contributes to the "American Men of Letters" series (Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1904, pp. x, 345), is much shorter than the official biography by Mr. C. H. Farnham (1900) and hardly comes into comparison with it. If the distinction be valid, Mr. Sedgwick is Parkman's interpreter rather than his biographer. While narrative occupies a large part of the book, one's attention is not diverted from personality to events. Mr. Sedgwick avoids magnifying the incidents of a career which, apart from the adventures related in the *Oregon Trail*, was uneventful. Throughout the early chapters he keeps himself carefully in the background and by citing fragments of autobiography makes Parkman illustrate his own character. The salient features no one can mistake — honesty, firmness of resolve, contempt for folly, and admiration of the strong. Were we bent on offering a detailed criticism of Mr. Sedgwick's work, we should look for a text in the last twenty-five pages, where Parkman's opinions are discussed and we are given a glimpse of his family life. "To his daughter he was a 'passionate Puritan,' — the phrase is just. Under his stoicism, under his reserve, under his gentleness, all cast in the Puritan mould, was this passionate spirit. *Chi non arde non risplende*, as the Umbrian proverb says" (p. 306). Words like these strip away externals and show us what prompted the daily heroism of an arduous, exacting life. Among the new materials which Mr. Sedgwick uses, the most interesting are Parkman's letters to the Abbé Casgrain (pp. 267-280). Our concluding word must be that this little volume is not only well written but contains much thoughtful and illuminating criticism.

C. W. C.

Select Statutes and other Documents Illustrative of the History of the United States, 1861-1898. Edited, with notes, by William MacDonald. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1903, pp. x, 442.) With this

volume Professor MacDonald completes his well-known series of which his *Select Charters, 1606-1775*, and *Select Documents, 1776-1861*, form the other two parts. The series is widely used by teachers of American history. It originated from the author's desire to make available to college students more of the sources in American history and to enable them to examine critically a considerable number of well-known documents. The final volume contains, in all, 131 documents, beginning with Lincoln's "Call for 75,000 Volunteers" and closing with the "Treaty of Paris" of 1898. Certain classes of documents are omitted entirely, for instance, those relating to public lands; but the more important subjects relating to the political history of the period are well presented in a representative list. The political and civil phases of the war; slavery and civil rights; reconstruction and the readmission of the states; legal tender, silver coinage, banking, and finance; the amendments and acts relating thereto; naturalization, polygamy, and Chinese exclusion; the election of senators; the electoral count; the presidential succession; and recent phases of expansion — these subjects indicate the scope and importance of the topics selected. Certain notable presidential messages, like the Venezuelan message of President Cleveland of 1893, are included. The valuable notes and references preceding each document are included in this volume as in the others. Professor MacDonald's final volume sustains the merit of a series whose usefulness and value have already received wide recognition. JAMES A. WOODBURN.

Life of Joseph Cowen (M. P. for Newcastle, 1874-86). By William Duncan. (London, Newcastle, and New York, The Walter Scott Publishing Company, 1904, pp. xi, 252). The late Joseph Cowen was one of the most prominent politicians and publicists of the Victorian era in England — one of the men with a national reputation who for some reason or another never reached ministerial or cabinet rank. He was the proprietor-editor of the *Newcastle Daily Chronicle*, and as editor and politician was a man of pronounced individuality. In the later years of his life he clashed with Gladstone and also with Mr. John Morley, who succeeded him in the representation of Newcastle in the House of Commons. He was the friend and champion in England of Garibaldi. He was also for many years the friend of William Lloyd Garrison; and he and his newspaper stood out for the cause of the North, when Gladstone declared at Newcastle in October, 1861, that the South had made a nation. Mr. Cowen was also an advocate of coöperation in the days when the movement in England had few friends outside the working-classes; and he had a prominent part in the contest for the nine hours' day, which was waged by the Amalgamated Society of Engineers in 1871. Mr. Cowen was a man of varied public activities and much more than local fame; and he certainly was worthy a better biography than this which has been written by Mr. Duncan, who was for many years closely associated with him as subeditor of the *Chronicle*. The incidents and episodes of Mr. Cowen's life are narrated with some detail; but he does not live in these pages,

nor do we find an adequate treatment of his political influence or of his career as a journalist. In the letters collected here is valuable material concerning the relations between members and constituents under the altered conditions consequent upon the Reform Act of 1867, the act which may be said to have brought these local political associations — the caucuses of the English electoral system — into existence.

Of the two recently published volumes touching on Irish political history from the time of O'Connell to Parnell, Mr. Michael Davitt's *The Fall of Feudalism in Ireland* (New York, Harpers, 1904, pp. xvi, 751) is from every point of view most likely to have a permanent value. It will have this value for two reasons. Mr. Davitt gives the platforms and manifestos of the Land League and the National League, many of the resolutions which were adopted at the important meetings of these two bodies, and much of the correspondence which has any significance in the history of the agrarian and home-rule movements. All through his work he is careful and precise as to dates. He writes from a partizan viewpoint and, as might have been expected, makes no attempt to conceal his partizanship. Despite this fact he has done good service to contemporary history by the care he has bestowed on the documentary part of his exhaustive work. The second reason why his *Fall of Feudalism* is likely to be turned to by English and Irish historians is that he gives an insight into the character of Parnell. What Parnell stood for in English and Irish politics, how little sympathy he had with democratic thought and democratic movement in England, is made clearer in Davitt's pages than in any other of the numerous volumes which have been written about the Irish movement since 1885, not excluding Richard Barry O'Brien's *Life of Parnell* (2 vols., London, 1899).

Mr. Justin McCarthy in *An Irishman's Story* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1904, pp. 436) goes over much of the same ground as Davitt. He was in Parliament from 1879 to 1902, and he details the conditions under which Biggar and Parnell began their policy of obstruction, explaining anew what the Nationalists hoped to gain from making the House of Commons an unworkable institution. He was long in close association with Parnell, but he was and is such an indiscriminating admirer of Parnell that his chapters on the Parnell Commission and the exposure of Parnell's duplicity can have no permanent value. A serviceable chapter in Mr. McCarthy's autobiography, from an American point of view, is the one in which he shows that middle-class and working-class England had no part in the sympathy which official and aristocratic England evinced toward the South in the War of the Rebellion, and in which he recalls the efforts which he made, when he was in this country from 1868 to 1870, to correct the prevailing misapprehensions here as to the real feelings of the English people on the issue between the North and the South. Historical students who may turn to either of these volumes will be compelled continuously to keep in mind the nationality

and political environment of the writers; for with both Davitt and McCarthy every Irishman on the popular side is a patriot, an orator, or a statesman. Irish history since the Revolution of 1688, written by Irishmen, has ever been cast in this mold.

E. P.

To readers who desire to study war as war, Colonel W. H. H. Waters's translation of *The War in South Africa*, prepared in the historical section of the General Staff, Berlin (London, John Murray; New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, pp. ix, 280), will be of more than ordinary value, and will supersede most of the books published in England by newspaper correspondents. With the causes leading up to the war, the German military authorities give themselves no concern. There is a splendidly-written description of the topography and climate of what are now the four British colonies: Natal, Cape Colony, the Orange River Colony, and the Transvaal; and with this as a preface the history of military operations begins. It is written in a coldly scientific spirit, very much from the objective point of view, and deals out praise and censure — mostly censure — for the British generals with as little regard to personal feelings as though the authors were critically examining the military careers of Cromwell or Wellington. The one department of the army which comes in for unstinted praise is that concerned with the commissariat. The history begins with the attack on General Symons at Dundee in Natal, October 20, 1899, nine days after Kruger's ultimatum, and in the present volume is carried only to Kronje's surrender at Paardeburg on February 27, 1900. A second volume is to be published which will treat of Roberts's march to Bloemfontein and the guerrilla fighting which continued until the Boers accepted terms in May, 1902.

In view of the present political situation, it may not be out of place here to make a few brief comments on some of the chief books about Russia which have appeared in English during the last couple of years. It is true that none of them are strictly histories,¹ but all refer frequently, with more or less accuracy, to recent historical events. Unquestionably the best of them is Mr. Geoffrey Drage's *Russian Affairs* (London, John Murray; New York, E. P. Dutton and Company, 1904, pp. xv, 738), an excellent study of present conditions, full of useful information. The author deals in fact not fiction; he is careful and discriminating, moderate in statement, and wisely cautious in his conclusions. Even his discussion of foreign politics, though not free from partizanship, is never offensively English in tone.

For more optimistic views, we have but to turn to *All the Russias* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1902, pp. xii, 476), by Mr. Henry Norman, M.P., a journalist and traveler of much experience, wide reputation, and great self-confidence. He has given us a painstaking work,

¹ The recent historical works of Messrs. Kovalevsky, Morfill, and Skrine have all been reviewed in the AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW.

not very profound, to be sure, but well written, and he at least deserves credit for being the one English writer who has had the no small courage to state fairly the St. Petersburg government's side of the case in regard to its recent policy in Finland. Mr. Norman is full of admiration for what the Russians have done in Central Asia, and equally so for the achievements of Mr. Witte, who at the time that these words were penned was at the height of his power, and not yet, as far as the general public knew, the object of relentless criticism at home and abroad.

On the other hand, if we wish for the extreme opposite point of view to that of Mr. Norman, we can get it in *Russia, Her Strength and Her Weakness*, by Wolf von Schierbrand, Ph. D. (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1904, pp. xv, 304), whose production, in spite of its claim of impartiality, suggested by the title and promised in the preface, is nevertheless little more than a long rhetorical diatribe, neither new in its facts nor convincing in its conclusions.

All three of the above volumes are general in their scope, though they deal at some length with Russia's progress in Asia. Should we desire more specific works on this last subject, after passing over the records of mere Siberian globe-trotters like J. F. Fraser, J. W. Bookwalter, M. M. Shoemaker and Miss A. M. B. Meakin, we can find much satisfactory information in *Asiatic Russia*, by George Frederick Wright, LL.D., F.G.S.A. (New York, McClure, Phillips, and Company, 1902, 2 vols., pp. xxii, 290; xii, 291-637), a good compendium of geographical, statistical, and other facts concerning Russia of the present day. Its tone is appreciative, but Mr. Wright is primarily a geologist, not an historian, and his political comments at times betray a certain naïve optimism and credulity. Although in general knowledge he is far superior, the insight he displays is often less keen than that of Mr. Wirt Gerrare, author of *Greater Russia* (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1903, pp. xiii, 337), a superficial but well-written and amusing book. The chapters in it that treat of agricultural and industrial expansion can be compared with Mr. Norman's roseate picture, though neither can be taken so seriously as the more thorough and more recent study of Mr. Drage. Mr. Gerrare's account of his own experiences is entertaining, and his observations are good, but he is not accurate. For instance, his new Russian railway in Mongolia from Khailar to Kalgan at the foot of the Great Wall does not seem to exist except in his imagination. At any rate, though hesitatingly referred to by Drage, it is contemptuously dismissed by B. L. Putnam Weale (the nom de plume of a young Englishman of Semitic blood, resident in China) in his extremely clever and entertaining, if highly prejudiced, *Manchu and Muscovite* (New York, Macmillan, 1904, pp. xx, 552), which, thanks to its author's knowledge and acute observation, makes an excellent complement to Alexander Hosie's standard work on *Manchuria* (London, Methuen, 1901, pp. xii, 293).

Finally we must not forget to mention the volume that has had a greater circulation in this country than any of the above-mentioned,

namely, *The Russian Advance*, by Albert J. Beveridge (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1903, pp. v, 486). The writer has had to suffer from the disadvantages as well as from the advantages which are inherent to the position of a traveling American senator. He saw what was easily to be seen, he judged hastily but intelligently, and he was ready to generalize on the slightest provocation. Still we must admit that even when grandiloquent he studiously tries to be fair. It is just this fairness which is perhaps the quality most conspicuously lacking in the ordinary American appreciation of things Russian at the present moment.

ARCHIBALD CARY COOLIDGE.

Greater America, by Archibald R. Colquhoun (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1904, pp. x, 436), is an excellent book, but one which will claim more attention from the historians of a coming generation than from those of to-day. Mr. Colquhoun is not content with the historian's usual practice of illustrating the present by the past; he would foretell the future by the present; his book may be said to be not only up to date but beyond it. "An attempt is here made—it is believed for the first time—to present American evolution as a whole, to treat her history from the stand-point of its wide national significance, to show to what point she has progressed, to indicate what her future may be."

The scope of the book is the whole wide world. Most of the seventeen chapters refer by title to the affairs of North, Central, and South America, but these affairs are now so interwoven with the interests of other continents that scarcely one of the states that figure in the *Almanach de Gotha* fails to receive consideration. There is no room for the details of history in such a book, and the reader will not find them. He will find instead a suggestive appreciation of the present position of the United States and a forecast of its future position by a man who, if he lacks some of the attributes of the professional scholar, has others still more important for his difficult task—wide travel, keen observation, a ready discrimination of values in the phenomena of modern life. The author justifies his freedom from the trammels of "documents" by the use he makes of it.

The contents of the book are so varied that they cannot be described both briefly and accurately. Neither do the author's prophecies lend themselves to condensation; they are too carefully guarded by the provisional form of statement to be twisted into positive predictions. This, at least, can be said: that every American reader will find the book both interesting and instructive, and that those who are concerned with the foreign relations and colonial problems of this country cannot afford to neglect it.

CLIVE DAY.

America, Asia and the Pacific, by Wolf von Schierbrand, Ph.D. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1904, pp. ix, 334), is a book

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. X.—30.

of different caliber. The author is a journalist of real distinction, and has put under obligation all people interested in modern Germany by his writings on that country, but he has apparently entered an unfamiliar field in this venture, and made a book on the question of America's interest in the far east as he would write up a story for a paper about to go to press. The book is a compilation of ill-digested material, containing, so far as the reviewer could learn, nothing that is at the same time new, true, and important.

C. D.

The Official and Statistical Register of the State of Mississippi, 1904, is a stout volume of seven hundred pages compiled by Mr. Dunbar Rowland, the state director of archives and history. Although intended primarily for the use of members of the legislature and state officers, it contains some well-selected material of value to students of Mississippi history. In the first place, there are reprints of various organic acts relating to the territorial history of the state, such as the act of Congress for the organization of the territory, the first territorial law enacted by the governor and the judges, the enabling act of Congress, etc. This is followed by reprints of the several constitutions which have been in force, the last of which is carefully annotated, and all of them containing authentic lists of the signers. Of particular value to the historical student are an outline sketch of the history of the state, a list of territorial and state officials from 1798 to 1904 (which is a compilation containing evidence of considerable research and painstaking effort), and a number of informing essays by local experts on the resources and industrial growth of the state. The least useful part of the *Register* is that containing biographical sketches of the state officers and members of the legislature, which in the case of prominent persons often include their ancestors as far back as the Revolution.

J. W. G.

COMMUNICATIONS

THE PHILIPPINE "SITUADO" FROM THE TREASURY OF NEW SPAIN.

MR. JAMES A. LE ROY in his review of volume XIV of *The Philippine Islands* in the October number of the REVIEW (p. 169) calls attention to an explanation of this old-time annual remittance of specie to the islands which is widely at variance with the accepted view that before the nineteenth century the government expenditures in the islands always exceeded the receipts and that the deficit was made up from the treasury of New Spain. The new explanation of this annual remittance was offered by Señor Felipe Govantes, a Spanish official of long service in the islands, in his *Compendio de la Historia de Filipinas* (Manila, 1877), appendix 23. As this work is not accessible to me, I am limited to the citation made by Pardo de Tavera in his *Biblioteca Filipina*, 193, to which Mr. Le Roy referred, and which I will give in an English translation :

Many erroneously believe that the *situado* that came from Mexico to the Philippines was in consequence of a deficit in the treasury of the archipelago. We shall point out their mistake, which has been and still is of serious consequence to the Philippines. . . . The ships that carried the products of the Philippines went from Manila to Acapulco, and in the latter port the export duties were collected on the cargo from Manila as there was no custom-house in Manila ; and since the expenses of the Philippines were calculated in Mexico, exactly what was needed of the amount realized from the exportation from the Philippines was transmitted, and the larger part was retained in Mexico. That which came to Manila was called the *situado*. There was then no deficit, but on the contrary a considerable surplus.

This explanation apparently is accepted by Pardo de Tavera. It is, however, I am convinced, entirely erroneous. In 1608 the expenses exceeded the income by 135,017 pesos (*The Philippine Islands*, XIV, 268). In 1637 D. Juan Grau y Monfalcon prepared an elaborate report to the king on Philippine commerce and finances (see *Colección de Documentos Inéditos del Archivo de Indias, América y Oceanía*, VI, 364-484). In this he gives an average Philippine budget as follows :

Expenses 850,734 pesos ; receipts 573,922 pesos. The item of receipts includes 309,000 pesos derived from "the duties, freights, *almojarifazgo* [import duties], and the rest collected in New Spain from the merchandise that each year comes from the islands and remitted to Manila" by the law of 1606 (*ibid.*, 425-428). There was then in the first half of the seventeenth century a deficit of about 276,000 pesos. Over against this, Grau y Monfalcon would set 30,000 pesos collected in New Spain through the *alcabala* (the tax on sales) from the Philippine products. The net deficit would then be nearly 250,000 pesos.

The law of February 19, 1606, reads: "We ordain that the duties and freights that are collected in the port of Acapulco from the merchandise from the Philippines shall not be covered into the treasury of Mexico, but shall be expended for things needed in those islands, and that so much less be remitted from the treasury of Mexico" (*Recopilacion de Leyes de los Reinos de las Indias*, 5th edition, Madrid, 1841, IV, 131, lib. IX, tit. 45, ley 65; see also *The Philippine Islands*, XVII, 45-46).

If the duties collected on the goods from Manila were not covered into the Mexican treasury, they would not appear in the Mexican budget; and consequently the *situado* that does appear there is not, as Govantes asserts, a return of part of the revenue received from the duties on the Manila shipments, but a pure subsidy. These duties in the middle of the eighteenth century amounted in general to 7,500 pesos for the export duties, and 176,000 pesos for the *almojarifazgo*, which was used for refitting the ships, etc. (Delgado, *Historia de Filipinas*, Manila, 1892, 224. This is one of the most important of the old histories and was written about 1750). The French astronomer Le Gentil, who was in Manila for several months in 1765-1766, quotes a treasury report which showed a deficit in 1749. At the end of the report the remark was made, "le Roi faisant passer tous les ans du Mexique, cent dix mille piastres, il s'ensuit que les Philippines qui devroient profiter au Roi, lui sont au contraire très à charge" (*Voyage dans les Mers de l'Inde*, Paris, 1779-1781, II, 170).

Juan de la Concepcion discusses at length the Philippine budget of the middle of the eighteenth century (*Historia General de Filipinas*, XIV, 38-76). Among the assets is the *real situado*, 250,000 pesos; on the debit side (p. 46) is the item "Baxas de el Real situado de estas Islas" (abatements from the royal subsidy), 140,106 pesos.¹ This leaves 110,000 pesos as the net subsidy, the same figure given by Le Gentil. Even then there was a deficit of nearly 80,000 pesos. Juan de la Concepcion's budget is reproduced in condensed form by Foreman (*op. cit.*, 281).

Evidence could be multiplied to this effect. As I have said above, the entering of the *situado* among the expenditures of the kingdom of New Spain when the duties collected on the cargoes from Manila were not covered into the treasury proves the case if no other evidence were advanced. Humboldt gives the average items of appropriation of the Mexican budget for the years 1784-1789. The largest in the list is *situados* which have been sent to the colonies of America and Asia, 3,011,664 pesos. These *situados* averaged between 1788 and 1792 as follows, in pesos: Cuba, 1,826,000; Florida, 151,000; Porto Rico, 377,000; Philippines, 250,000; Louisiana, 557,000; Trinidad, 200,000; San Domingo, 274,000. During the Napoleonic wars the Philippines re-

¹ Explained by Foreman, as remittances in merchandise as a partial equivalent for the subsidy. *The Philippine Islands*, ed. 1899, 281.

quired a *situado* of 500,000 pesos (A. von Humboldt, *Ensayo Político sobre la Nueva España*, 2d ed., 5 vols., Paris, 1827, IV, 232, 239-240).

According to Govantes's hypothesis, if the *situado* of 250,000 pesos was only the smaller part of the duties collected at Acapulco, the rest being retained in Mexico, then the duties must have been over 200 per cent. when the Manila-Acapulco cargo was limited to 250,000 pesos in value and over 100 per cent. when the value limit of the cargos was raised to 500,000 pesos. But this is contrary to all the evidence. As noted above, in the middle of the eighteenth century the export duties and the *almojarifazgo* collected at Acapulco amounted to 183,500 pesos on the Manila valuation of 500,000 pesos, and this money was used to refit the galleon and to procure supplies for the return voyage (Delgado, *op. cit.*, 224). In 1696 the Acapulco collections amounted to 80,000 pesos on a Manila valuation of 250,000 pesos (John Francis Gemelli Careri, *A Voyage round the World*, in Churchill, *Voyages*, London, 1732, IV, 480, entry for January 31).

EDWARD G. BOURNE.

THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ARTS AND SCIENCE.

THE International Congress of Arts and Science, which met at St. Louis during the third week of September, brought together distinguished scholars from every part of the world and was, perhaps, the most important episode of the Louisiana Purchase Exposition. Many readers of the REVIEW are already familiar with the fact that in the choice and arrangement of subjects the interests of history were not neglected. The key to the whole scheme of proceedings is furnished by the official programme of the Congress, wherein the chief branches of knowledge are divided and subdivided. In this document "Historical Science" stands out as one of seven main divisions, the others being "Normative Science", "Physical Science", "Mental Science", "Utilitarian Sciences", "Social Regulation", and "Social Culture". That historical science was conceived of in a broad spirit by those who prepared the programme is also evident from the scheme of subdivision. Not only did political and economic history appear under this heading, but special categories were provided for law, language, literature, art, and religion. In a word, the value of the historical method was fully, even generously, recognized. Of the seven main divisions no other embraced so many sections. A chart of graphic statistics could be made to show in vivid colors that "Historical Science", with thirty-two sections, ranked before "Physical Science", with thirty-one.

As illustrating the catholicity of scholarship the International Congress was a fine spectacle, but as to its usefulness a final verdict must rest upon the quality of the papers it drew forth. At the present moment no human being can venture to appraise the value of the addresses which were delivered in the division of Historical Science alone. The sessions

of the Congress covered less than a week, and so many meetings were in progress at the same time that it proved physically impossible to attend more than a small fraction of them. Until the proceedings are in print judgment must be suspended, but meanwhile two things may be said with some confidence. It is doubtful whether any one who spoke at St. Louis treated the Congress contemptuously in the sense that he paid little heed to the preparation of his address. Lamprecht, it is true, spoke from the full heart without the least vestige of a note, but to say that he spoke carelessly or that he gave his audience much less than he might have given it, would be unjust. Bury seems to have voiced the general sentiment when in his closing words he observed: "It is not very bold to predict that historians of the distant future in tracing the growth of coöperation and tendencies to a federation of human effort . . . will record this Congress . . . as a significant point in this particular stage of man's progress towards his unknown destiny." One who wrote thus was not likely to let his own contribution fall far below his best level.

In the second place it should be stated that the personnel of the Congress was on the whole remarkable. Conspicuous gaps were, of course, visible among the historians as among the representatives of other branches, but making every possible subtraction on this score there remained enough speakers of high standing to invest the sessions with extraordinary interest. In the department of political and economic history the foreign delegation comprised Mahaffy, Pais, Cordier, Lamprecht, Bury, and Conrad; while Furtwängler, Budde, Harnack, and Réville were speaking in other departments on subjects of deep historical significance. Among American scholars, President Woodrow Wilson delivered the address with which the proceedings of the historical division opened; and papers dealing, the one with "Historical Science", the other with "History and Literature", were given before the department of political and economic history by Professors W. M. Sloane and J. H. Robinson. Professor G. B. Adams discussed the problems of medieval history, Professors F. J. Turner and E. G. Bourne represented the history of America, and Professor S. N. Patten was the colleague of Conrad in the section devoted to the history of economic institutions.

A criticism or even a description of the views advanced in all these papers would lead us far beyond the limits assigned to the present notice. Here one must be content with saying that for historians, no less than for the exponents of the physical and utilitarian sciences, the St. Louis Congress was a memorable occasion. It is expected that the text of the addresses will be published in full by the Directors of the Exposition.

C. W. COLBY.

NOTES AND NEWS

The Honorable George Frisbie Hoar, ex-president of the American Historical Association, died at his home in Worcester, Massachusetts, in the early part of October, at the age of seventy-eight. Mr. Hoar was born in Concord, Massachusetts, in 1826, graduated from Harvard College and the Dane Law School (Harvard), served in the Massachusetts legislature, was elected a member of the House of Representatives of the Forty-First Congress, and in 1877 was elected United States Senator. His interest in American history was always keen, and while his public duties prevented him from devoting any appreciable time to historical research or writing, he was an important member of such organizations as the Massachusetts Historical Society, the American Antiquarian Society, the New England Historic-Genealogical Society, and the Virginia Historical Society. He served one year, 1895, as president of the American Historical Association and was henceforward a life-member of the council of the Association. Most of his historical contributions are to be found in the publications of these societies. In 1882, in the annual report of the council to the American Antiquarian Society, he contributed an account of the materials for historical research in the city of Washington, which, while slight and containing some errors, remained for years the principal source of information. Among other of his articles published by the same society may be mentioned *Government in Canada and the United States Compared* (1891), and *The Obligations of New England to the County of Kent* (1885). His principal service to historians, however, lay in the writing of his own biography, *Reminiscences of Seventy Years* (1903).

Henry Butler Clarke, who had become known in late years as a promising scholar in Spanish history, especially on its literary side, died in the late summer. His writings include a *Handbook of Spanish Literature*, and *The Cid Campeador* (in "Heroes of the Nations"); and recently he was engaged on a history of Spain in the nineteenth century.

M. Henri Wallon, secretary of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres since 1873, died recently, in his ninety-second year. His published writings include many volumes, among them six on *Histoire du Tribunal Révolutionnaire de Paris*, and five on *Les Représentants du Peuple en Mission et la Justice Révolutionnaire dans les Départements en l'an II*.

Friedrich Ratzel, professor of geography in the University of Leipzig, died on the eighth of August, in his sixtieth year. American students who have attended lectures of his will remember his strong, active personality, and the clear and large perspective he gave to whatever he discussed. Always occupying some high point and looking far around

him, his principal influence upon historical students — as possibly upon others — was in extending their horizon. This he did in his teaching, and also by many writings, chiefly however by his *Anthropogeographie* and *Politische Geographie*. Americans will recall also his *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Nord-Amerika*.

The Rev. Dr. Benjamin F. De Costa, author of *The Pre-Columbian Discovery of America*, *The Northmen in Maine*, and *Verrazano the Explorer*, died in New York on November 4.

John Foster Kirk died at his home in Philadelphia on September 21. He was born in New Brunswick in 1824 and came to Boston in 1842. For eleven years he was secretary to William H. Prescott, receiving an impulse to historical research which resulted in his three-volume *History of Charles the Bold* (1864-1868). In 1873-1876 he prepared the revised edition of Prescott's works, brought out by the Lippincotts. For two years, 1886-1888, he was a lecturer in history at the University of Pennsylvania. His position since 1870 as editor of *Lippincott's Magazine* made extended historical research impossible, and his *Charles the Bold* remains his one achievement in that field.

The next annual meeting of the Association of History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland will be held in the Washington Square Building of New York University, March 10 and 11, 1905. Papers upon the curriculum in history for grammar-schools will be read and some specific recommendations made with regard to the proper subjects to be taught, the order of sequence, and the content. The discussion of the propositions put forth at last year's meeting concerning the work in secondary schools (given in detail in the *Minutes*, issued about December 15) will be continued, and some features of the work will be entered into in greater detail in order to give a more complete understanding of the committee's idea. On Friday evening Professor Stevenson, of Rutgers College, will speak upon "The Early Cartography of the New World" and Professor Brigham, of Colgate University, will speak on "The Character and Limitations of Geographical Control Illustrated by the Chattanooga Campaign". Fuller announcements will be sent later to those who may desire them by the secretary, E. H. Castle, Teachers College, Columbia University.

It is announced that a number of the scattered writings of the late York Powell will be collected and published in a single volume, together with a memoir based especially on Powell's letters to friends. The work is in charge of Professor O. Elton, of Liverpool.

Professor Ch. V. Langlois, of the University of Paris, visited several of the universities of this country in the fall. At Chicago he lectured on "La Tradition Historique de la France".

The University of Chicago has recently acquired Professor George Elliott Howard's special "Library of Matrimonial Institutions". It consists of about 1,700 volumes and is probably the largest and best col-

lection of monographs ever made on the subject of marriage, divorce, and the family. The books were gathered by Mr. Howard during the many years devoted to his recently published *History of Matrimonial Institutions*. They are of great interest to all students of religious, juridical, and sociological history.

The *New York Public Library Bulletin* for November contains the fifth and concluding part of a "List of Works Relating to Naval History". This bibliography, the first four parts of which appeared in the *Bulletins* for June, July, August, and September, is arranged by countries, and the entries for each country are classified. It fills about three hundred columns, seventy-five of which are devoted to the United States. In the November *Bulletin* are also a "List of Works relating to Shakers", and the journal of an unknown Pennsylvania soldier, kept during the campaign of 1776 around New York and the retreat through New Jersey. The September *Bulletin* contains a "List of Maps of the World". These two hundred thirty-three maps are those that were on exhibition in the Lenox Library during the recent geographical congress.

A *History Syllabus for Secondary Schools*, prepared by a special committee, of the New England History Teachers' Association, of which Professor H. D. Foster was chairman, has been published by Heath (1904, pp. 375). It covers the four years' work in history and may be obtained entire or in pamphlets that cover a single year.

A "Provisional list of special collections in European history acquired by American libraries during 1903 and 1904", by Professor W. H. Siebert, is in *The Library Journal* for September.

Professor J. H. Robinson's *Readings in European History* (Boston, Ginn and Co., 1904) should meet with a wide welcome in the schools. It is in the main a collection of extracts from the sources, chosen with the purpose of illustrating the progress of culture in western Europe since the German invasions, and the selection of matter has been made with such judgment that the vivifying, interest-creating objects of collections of this sort are attained, in this instance, to an exceptional degree. Though designed directly to supplement the same writer's *Introduction to the History of Western Europe*, the material here gathered may be used advantageously with any of the usual texts. The first volume (pp. xxxi, 551), closing with selections on the Italian cities during the Renaissance, appeared in the fall; the second volume, beginning with Europe at the opening of the sixteenth century, is to be ready early this year. It is announced also that an abridged edition for use in high-schools is in preparation.

Students in several lines — economics and numismatics, as well as history — will welcome the latest addition to the "Handbuch" of medieval and modern history appearing under the editorship of von Below and Meinecke: *Allgemeine Münzkunde und Geldgeschichte des Mittelal-*

ters und der neueren Zeit, by A. Luschin von Ebengreuth (Munich, R. Oldenbourg). A comprehensive, competent manual on this subject has long been needed.

The second volume in "The Story of Exploration" series, now issuing under the editorship of J. Scott Keltie, describes the exploration of inland Arabia as far as it has been achieved: *The Penetration of Arabia, a Record of the Development of Western Knowledge concerning the Arabian Peninsula*, by David G. Hogarth (New York, F. A. Stokes Company, 1904, pp. xiii, 359). The author sets forth at the outset that he has not penetrated Arabia himself; that his personal acquaintance with its inhabitants and their language is small; that his sole qualification for writing the story of Arabian exploration rests on a long study of the literature of Arabian travel; and that his book must be regarded therefore as a mere essay in the polarization, appreciation, and introduction to the public of other men's first-hand work. The public, for its part, has good reason to be grateful. Mr. Hogarth's record both of "The Pioneers" and of "The Successors" is simple, intelligently proportioned, and humanly interesting. Moreover, the written story is rendered more real by many pictures and maps.

Africa from South to North, through Marotseland, by Major A. St. H. Gibbons (New York, Lane, 1904, 2 vols., pp. xix, 276, xxi, 297), is an extremely interesting account of the expedition organized by Major Gibbons in 1898, the objects of which were to determine the geographical limits of Lewanika's country, making a hydrographical and ethnographical survey of it; to define the Congo-Zambesi watershed, discovering the source of the Zambesi and to what extent it and its affluents are navigable; and to furnish the late Cecil Rhodes with information that would be of service in selecting a route for the projected transcontinental railway. The two volumes are illustrated with many photographs, taken during the expedition, while three large maps in cover pockets represent the results of the exploration.

The Early History of India, by Vincent A. Smith, represents an endeavor to set forth a connected narrative of events in Indian political history from 600 B. C. to the Mohammedan conquest (Oxford, University Press).

Mr. Sidney C. Tapp, of Atlanta, Georgia, has written a small book, though of many chapters — twenty-seven in two hundred and forty-five pages — on *The Story of Anglo-Saxon Institutions, or the Development of Constitutional Government*. Its general character is fairly indicated by the writer's statement of his purpose, "to demonstrate from historical facts that the Anglo-Saxon race is the only race that has ever had a true conception of republican institutions or solved correctly the problem of self-government" (New York, Putnam, 1904, pp. ix, 245).

Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* again sees the light in a new edition of two volumes, with introduction, notes, and marginal summary

by Professor E. Cannan of the University of London (New York, Putnam's, 1904, pp. xlviii, 462, vii, 506). The text of this edition is that of the fifth, which was published before Smith's death; it has been collated with that of the first and the differences have been noted.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: *The Oxford School of Historians* (Church Quarterly Review, October); Henri Chérot, *Une Révue de Synthèse en Histoire* (Études, October 20); Simon N. Patten, *The Present Problem in the Economic Interpretation of History* (Annals American Academy, November).

ANCIENT HISTORY.

Under the title, "Die Auswanderung der Krieger unter Psammetich I. und der Söldneraufstand in Elephantine unter Apries", Heinrich Schaefer publishes, translates, and interprets in *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte* (IV, 2, p. 152 ff.), an inscription in which he finds documentary evidence for the emigration of the soldier caste from Egypt to Ethiopia. This remarkable self-exile of 240,000 Egyptians, vouched for primarily by Herodotus, has often been regarded as mythical. Among the communications and reports presented in the same number of the *Beiträge* is one from Freiherr Hiller von Gaertringen regarding the publication of the Greek inscriptions. This important work, undertaken over thirty years ago by the Prussian Academy of Sciences, and carried on hitherto under the management of Professor Adolf Kirchhoff, has recently been entrusted to Mommsen's son-in-law, Professor U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. A rearrangement of the parts and a reorganization of the staff have already been effected. A central bureau for the receipt of "squeezes", publications, etc., has been established in Berlin W., Potsdamerstr. 120. This bureau has been put in charge of Baron Hiller, and through the *Beiträge* this genial scholar asks for the coöperation of all those in the possession of pertinent epigraphical material. Professor Hiller is the man who conducted at his own expense very valuable excavations on the island of Thera, and who is held in kindly remembrance by the many Americans who, chiefly under Professor Doerpfeld's guidance, visited Thera while the work was in progress.

The influence of archæology in provoking a reëxamination of the literary sources of Greek and Roman history is evidenced in some recent work by American students. Thus, because of the results reached by archæologists in their studies of numerous theater ruins, Mr. Roy C. Flickinger, now of Epworth University, Oklahoma, has been led to devote his doctoral dissertation to a test of Plutarch upon the subject: *Plutarch as a Source of Information on the Greek Theater* (University of Chicago Press, 1904, pp. 64). Also, the first of a group of *Studies in Herodotus* (Madison, Wisconsin, 1904, pp. 47), by A. G. Laird, of the University of Wisconsin, deals with statements of Herodotus in connection with the inscription on the Serpent-Column of Delphi and its counterpart at Olympia. The other studies in Mr. Laird's pamphlet are upon

“Herodotus, and the Greek Forces at Salamis and Plataea”, and “The Battle of Salamis”.

Roman history during the later Republic and the early Principate is to be treated on an elaborate scale by A. H. J. Greenidge. The first volume covers about thirty years, 133-104 B. C.; five other volumes are to follow (London, Methuen).

Professor W. C. Lawton's *Introduction to Classical Greek Literature*, which was well received, is now followed by a similar *Introduction to Classical Latin Literature* (New York, Scribners, 1904, pp. x, 326). It tells of Latin writers in such a manner as to kindle desire to read of them and in them—which cannot be said, alas, of all like books about the classics.

Available material for the use of classes in Roman history has been notably increased of late through *A Source Book of Roman History*, by Dana C. Munro (Boston, Heath, 1904, pp. viii, 258). Two hundred and five pieces are thus brought together and made conveniently accessible—pieces covering the time from the foundation of Rome to the reign of Diocletian. They are numbered consecutively, but are classified in twelve groups, under such captions as “The Roman Army”, “The Last Century of the Republic”, “Christianity and Stoicism”, “Roman Life and Society”.

An English translation of Harnack's recent work on the spread of the Christian religion is among the announcements of Messrs. Williams and Norgate, London: *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*, translated and edited by James Moffatt.

Much has been done upon the history of early Christianity within the Roman empire but relatively little upon its history in countries beyond the empire. Particular interest therefore is attached to *Le Christianisme dans l'Empire Perse sous la Dynastie Sassanide (224-632)*, by J. Labourt, recently published by the house of Lecoffre, Paris.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Guiraud, *La Population de la Grèce Ancienne* (Revue de Paris, October 15); F. Martroye, *Une Tentative de Révolution Sociale en Afrique. Donatistes et Circoncissions. I.* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

M. Charles Diehl's latest work relative to Byzantine history will doubtless find many readers: *Theodora, Impératrice de Byzance* (Paris, Rey).

A long work upon Mohammedan history has been undertaken in Italy: *Annali dell' Islam*, by L. Caetani, published through the house of Hoepli at Milan. The first volume contains, besides an extended introduction, the record of the first six years from the Hegira. It is planned that the work shall comprise twelve volumes in all, and come down to 1544.

Ethnological and political conditions bearing upon the history of both Europe and Asia in the ninth and tenth centuries are treated in a recent work by J. Marquart: *Osteuropäische und ostasiatische Streifzüge*, published with the aid of the Royal Academy of Berlin (Leipzig, Weicher).

Number xv of the *Lists and Indexes* descriptive of material preserved in the Public Record Office of England, that is, "List of Ancient Correspondence of the Chancery and Exchequer" (1902), is reviewed in a specially scholarly and serviceable manner by Ch. V. Langlois, in the *Journal des Savants* (July, August, 1904). Especially set forth is the value of the material described for French-English history of the thirteenth century.

A sort of aid for the use of classes in history which has not been employed before in this country was recently brought out by the Century Company: *Medieval Civilization, Selected Studies from European Authors*, translated and edited by Professor Dana C. Munro and Dr. George C. Sellery (New York, 1904, pp. x, 391). It is a book similar to the collections of "Lectures Historiques" which flourish in France. With two exceptions the selections are from modern writers — Lavissee, Luchaire, Lamprecht, among others — and concern a variety of subjects, such as "Faith and Morals of the Franks", "The Realities of Feudalism", "City Life in Germany". The editors state that this volume is designed for the use of beginners in medieval history, and that another volume, intended to afford additional supplementary material for more mature students, will be issued later.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Jacquin, *La Question de la Prédestination aux V^e et VI^e Siècles* (Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique, October); Ph. Heck, *Ständeproblem, Wergelder und Münzrechnung der Karolingerzeit* (Vierteljahrschrift für Social- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, II, 3, 4); G. Schlumberger, *Une Révolution de Palais en l'An 1042 à Byzance* (Revue des Deux Mondes, September 15); K. Hampe, *Deutsche Angriffe auf das Königreich Sizilien im Anfang des dreizehnten Jahrhunderts* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, October); P. Arminjon, *Universités Musulmanes d'Égypte. I* (Revue de Paris, September 15).

MODERN HISTORY.

It is, possibly, the publication of lectures delivered by Bishop Stubbs that has suggested bringing out similar material left by Freeman. At all events, two volumes of Freeman's lectures are announced by Messrs. Macmillan, one on *Western Europe in the Fifteenth Century*, the other on *Western Europe in the Eighteenth Century*.

The connection between England and Zürich in the sixteenth century, in the spheres of literature, theology, and commerce, is the subject of a work announced by Mr. Elliot Stock, London: *The Relations between England and Zürich during the Reformation*, by T. Vetter, of the University of Zürich.

Mr. Andrew D. White has begun a series of articles in the *Atlantic Monthly* on "The Warfare of Humanity with Unreason". The first one, in the November number, treats of Grotius.

Contemporary questions concerning Morocco have doubtless led to the publication of *Les Relations de l'Espagne et du Maroc pendant le XVIII^e et le XIX^e Siècle*, a recent work by E. Rouard de Card, of the University of Toulouse (Paris, Pedone).

Among the most important accessions to historical literature upon the period of Napoleon are *Select Despatches from the British Foreign Office Archives relating to the Formation of the Third Coalition*, edited for the Royal Historical Society by J. H. Rose, Mr. R. M. Johnston's *The Napoleonic Empire in Southern Italy and the Rise of the Secret Societies*, 2 vols. (Macmillan, 1904), and the eighth and concluding part of M. Albert Sorel's *L'Europe et la Révolution Française*, which is occupied with the Coalition and the treaties of 1815.

The *Letters and Memoir* of the English Quaker, John Bellows, edited by his wife, form a volume of about four hundred pages (Holt, 1904). Among the few matters of historical interest treated are the conditions in Metz in 1870-1871, and the Armenian massacres of 1896. The interest of the letters lies mainly in their descriptions of persons and places.

Count Charles de Motiy, who was the secretary of the Congress of Berlin, has recorded his recollections of that assembly, of the scene, personages, questions discussed, and principal decisions, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes* for October 15 and November 1: "Souvenirs d'un Diplomate. — Récits et Portraits du Congrès".

To the Cambridge Historical Series has just been added a volume on European relations with the Orient: *Europe and the Far East*, by Sir R. K. Douglas, keeper of oriental printed books and manuscripts in the British Museum and professor of Chinese in King's College, London (Cambridge, University Press, 1904, pp. viii, 450).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. F. Preuss, *Mazarin und die "Bewerbung" Ludwigs XIV. um die deutsche Kaiserkrone 1657* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, October); De Fréville, *Une Armée Coloniale au XVII^e Siècle. Dupleix aux Indes* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); F. de Navenne, *Le premier Séjour de Christine de Suède en Italie* (Revue Historique, September); W. Miller, *Greece under the Turks, 1571-1684* (English Historical Review, October); A. Auzoux, *Conquête de la Colonie du Cap par les Anglais (1806)* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); A. d'Hautpoul, *Souvenirs d'Espagne et d'Angleterre (1811-1814)* (Revue de Paris, November 1, 15); C. Oman, *The French Losses in the Waterloo Campaign* (English Historical Review, October); A. D. White, *Chapters from my Diplomatic Life. Embassy at Berlin (1897-1902)*, I (Century, December); *The Japanese Revolution* (Quarterly Review, July).

GREAT BRITAIN.

The University of Oxford has accepted the offer of Mr. Alfred Beit to establish a resident professorship of colonial history. The lectures are to deal with the history of British colonial policy, the detailed history of the self-governing colonies, including those in America prior to 1776, and the detailed history of all other British possessions, past and present, exclusive of India.

We have received a new and revised edition, with introduction and annotations by John M. Robertson, of Buckle's *History of Civilization in England* (London, Routledge; New York, E. P. Dutton, 1904, pp. xlviii, 915). The volume is a complete reprint of Buckle's work, with all the notes; unfortunately the nine hundred pages of the text are in such small type as to try the strongest eyes.

Professor George B. Adams has a note in the *English Historical Review* for October, on the question as to whether London ever had a commune in the strict, legal sense of that term. After analyzing the available evidence, he concludes, in substance, that John, in 1191, assuming to represent the crown, granted such a commune to the city, but that the crown as such never recognized London as a true commune.

Dr. J. F. Baldwin, of Vassar College, read a paper before the Royal Historical Society in November on "The Beginnings of the King's Council in England". He laid special stress upon the activities of the council during the minority of Henry III. The paper is to appear in the society's *Transactions*.

Mr. Sydney Armitage-Smith has written a biography of John of Gaunt, drawing therefor upon both printed and unprinted material: *John of Gaunt, King of Castile and Leon, Duke of Aquitaine and Lancaster, Earl of Derby, Lincoln, and Leicester, Seneschal of England* (London, Constable, 1904, pp. xxviii, 490).

The fall publications in the field of history include a new book by Mr. Sidney Lee, entitled *Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century* (New York, Scribners, 1904, pp. xxiii, 337), based on lectures delivered at the Lowell Institute, Boston.

A series of reprints of the best of the historical biographies of English sovereigns made by writers in the Tudor and Stuart periods is announced by Messrs. T. C. and E. C. Jack, London: "Lives of the Kings", under the general editorship of Mr. Charles Whibley. The first number will be Edward Hall's *Chronicle of Henry VIII*; the second number, Camden's *Queen Elizabeth*.

We have received volume II of J. R. Tanner's *Catalogue of the Naval Manuscripts in the Pepysian Library* (Publications of the Navy Records Society, XXVII). The letters here calendared are those in the second and third manuscript volumes, and are between June 19, 1673, and December 31, 1674. Many of them relate to matters of mere

routine, but as a whole they throw much light on naval administration, and some letters are of importance. A short introduction, similar in arrangement to the general introduction in the first volume, is provided.

The recent publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission include *Calendars* of Stuart papers in the Royal Library—those relating to the Old Pretender and his sons—and the tenth volume in the series relating to manuscripts of the Marquis of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House. The Hatfield manuscripts here included are of the year 1600.

The fifth volume of *The History of the English Church*, jointly edited by the late Dean Stephens and the Reverend W. Hunt, covers a specially significant period: "The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I (1558-1625)". It is written by W. H. Frere (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1904, pp. xii, 413).

The annals of Victoria, from its earliest settlement as a British penal colony to the close of the last century, have been written by H. G. Turner, who has lived in Victoria for fifty years: *A History of the Colony of Victoria from its Discovery to its Absorption into the Commonwealth of Australia, 1797-1900*, 2 vols. (Longmans, 1904, pp. xvi, 396, x, 389.)

The bicentenary of the birth of a man of so large a following as that of John Wesley could hardly pass without occasioning commemorative writings. Of such order is the Reverend W. H. Meredith's *The Real John Wesley* (Cincinnati, Jennings and Pye, 1903, pp. 425). It disclaims any pretense to being a detailed biography, and is rather a series of pen-pictures, beginning with one upon the home at Epworth and closing with "His Translation" and "The Mother Church of Methodism". The lines are often interestingly drawn.

M. Jusserand has found time in the midst of his public life to continue his literary work. The second volume of his *Histoire Littéraire du Peuple Anglais* was published recently in Paris (Firmin-Didot).

The second instalment, consisting of four volumes, of the *Letters of Horace Walpole*, which has recently been published by the Clarendon Press, covers the period from November, 1760, to May, 1774, a time of great mental activity. The editing, as was the case with the other volumes, is done with remarkable thoroughness and conscientious care. A few letters not appearing in the Cunningham edition are given; but, though welcome, they do not seem on the whole significant. It is no exaggeration to say that one reads these pages with almost breathless interest. The letters during these years were not so much taken up as were the earlier letters with entertaining trivialities; political conditions, especially, and other matters of serious import receive more attention.

A short biography of Joseph Lancaster, who had a pioneer's part in elementary education in England, has been written by Principal Salmon, of the Swansea Training College, and published by the British and Foreign Schools Society, through Longmans, Green, and Company.

Two volumes of biographical matter upon so vigorous and fruitful a man as was the late Bishop of London will hardly seem too much: *Life and Letters of Mandell Creighton*, published by Longmans, Green, and Company. Of special interest also is the volume of *Letters of Bishop Stubbs*, edited by W. H. Hutton (London, Constable); likewise *The Life and Correspondence of John Duke, Lord Coleridge, Lord Chief Justice of England*, two volumes, edited by E. H. Coleridge (London, Heinemann).

In a new book, entitled *Scotland in the Time of Queen Mary*, Professor Hume Brown treats solely of the social and economic aspects of the period in view (London, Methuen).

Illustrations of Irish History and Topography, by C. Litton Falkiner (Longmans, Green, and Company), consists of (1) a series of original papers by the author illustrating "the manner and degree in which the local and general history of the country are intertwined", and (2) "descriptions of Ireland in the seventeenth century by seventeenth-century writers".

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Haverfield, *The Last Days of Silchester* (English Historical Review, October); Charles Gross, *The Medieval Law of Intestacy* (Harvard Law Review, XVIII, 2); H. Thurston, *The Canon Law of the Divorce [of Henry VIII]* (English Historical Review, October); Alexander Savine, *English Customary Tenure in the Tudor Period* (Quarterly Journal of Economics, November); W. R. Scott, *Scottish Industrial Undertakings before the Union*. II. *The Scots Linen Manufacture* (Scottish Historical Review, October); R. Garnett, *Correspondence of Archbishop Herring and Lord Hardwicke during the Revolution of 1745* (English Historical Review, July and October); J. H. Stevenson, *The Scottish Peerage* (Scottish Historical Review, October); E. M. Graham, *The Charity of the Boxe* (Scottish Historical Review, October); *British Rule in Egypt* (Quarterly Review, October).

FRANCE, SPAIN, ITALY.

A life of the Huguenot leader Coligny, both before and during the wars of religion, with supplementary chapters on Coligny's efforts to colonize the New World, the problems of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the causes of the rise and fall of Huguenotism, is among the books published recently by Messrs. Methuen, London: *Coligny*, by A. W. Whitehead.

An able, entertaining, and suggestive criticism of Montesquieu's theories, by Sir Courtenay Ilbert — the Romanes lecture of 1904 — has been published by Henry Frowde (1904).

Among the most important and interesting of the "Cahiers of 1789" are those of rural communities, which portray the condition and mind of the peasants of France on the eve of the Revolution; and many of them are still unpublished or are lost. Those relating to maritime Flanders

have been found in the archives of the Département du Nord by A. de Saint-Léger and P. Sagnac, and these gentlemen are preparing a critical edition of them, which is to be published this year under the auspices of the Société Dunkerquoise, in two volumes: *Les Cahiers de la Flandre Maritime en 1789* (address, H. Terquem, 12 rue Royer, Dunkirk).

He who would write the history of the kingdom of Leon — which has not been done as yet in a critical manner — will find some well-prepared material from which to draw in part in a series of forty-one royal charters, published by L. Barrau-Dihigo in the *Revue Hispanique* (Nos. 35 and 36). “Notes et Documents sur l’Histoire du Royaume de Leon. I. Chartes Royales Léonaises, 912-1037”.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. E. Fry, *French Painting in the Middle Ages* (Quarterly Review, October); G. Roloff, *Das französische Heer unter Karl VII* (Historische Zeitschrift, XCIII, 3); H. Hauser, *Le Journal de Louise de Savoie* (Revue Historique, November); P. Gachon, *Le Conseil Royal et les Protestants en 1698*, II and III (Revue Historique, September and November); F. Masson, *Les Bonaparte et la Corse* (Revue de Paris, September 1); Ph. Sagnac, *De la Méthode dans l’Étude des Institutions de l’Ancien Régime* (Revue d’Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, October); H. Bourgin, *L’Histoire Économique de la France de 1800 à 1830. État des Travaux et Questions à Traiter* (Revue d’Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, October); P. Caron *Les Sources Manuscrites Parisiennes de l’Histoire de la Révolution de 1848 et de la Deuxième République* (Revue d’Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine, November); W. P. Ker, *A Great French Scholar — Gaston Paris* (Quarterly Review, July); *The Commercial and Fiscal Policy of the Venetian Republic* (Edinburgh Review, October); A. Bonnefons, *La Cour des Deux-Siciles dans les premières Années de la Révolution Française* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, SWITZERLAND, BELGIUM.

German publications of the year 1903 that relate to modern German history are surveyed by Dr. Philippson in the *Revue Historique* for November-December.

The latest issue in Lamprecht’s *Deutsche Geschichte* (Freiburg i. Br., Heyfelder) is the first part of volume seven, which closes at the middle of the eighteenth century. At the same time and through the same publisher has appeared a volume in which Lamprecht surveys the course of historical writing since the middle of the eighteenth century: *Moderne Geschichtswissenschaft*.

The reimpression of *Germany, the Welding of a World Power*, by Wolf von Schierbrand, which was issued recently (New York, Doubleday, Page, and Co., 1904, pp. vii, 307), appears to contain no variations from the original publication of two years ago. It may be recalled that the writer of this book attempts to set before Americans — his adopted

countrymen — what are the principal characteristics of their German rivals, in the lines both of strength and of weakness.

Among recent publications relating to nineteenth-century history are two volumes of autobiography which should be of much interest, especially for students of Austrian history in the late sixties and early seventies: *Staatsminister Albert Schäffle. Aus meinem Leben* (Berlin, E. Hofmann).

It will be recalled that Professor Jackson's volume on *Zwingli* in the "Heroes of the Reformation" series contained an introductory chapter by Professor J. M. Vincent on "Switzerland at the Beginning of the Sixteenth Century". The writer of this chapter has lately treated the same subject in a more extended way, giving further citations of sources and additional material, so that the survey which occupied forty-five pages of the *Zwingli* volume now forms a pamphlet of fifty-five pages, in the *Johns Hopkins University Studies* (Series XXII, No. 5).

The *Recueil des Instructions Générales aux Nonces de Flandre (1596-1635)*, publication of which was signalized in the *REVIEW* for April (p. 634), possibly forms the first definite step toward an edition of the entire collection of papers which passed between the papal court and its nuncios and internuncios between 1596 and 1795. The pieces here given include only the general instructions to the earlier of these representatives, covering the period, generally speaking, of the reign of Albert and Isabella; but they indicate clearly the importance of this mass of documents for the religious history not only of the Catholic Netherlands, but also of the neighboring nations, especially Holland, Germany, France, and England. The work has been done by A. Cauchie and R. Maere, of the University of Louvain, and is issued under the auspices of the Belgian Royal Historical Commission (Brussels, Kiessling, 1904, pp. xlv, 283).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Hampe, *Kritische Bemerkungen zur Kirchenpolitik der Stauferzeit* (*Historische Zeitschrift*, XCIII, 3); A. Richel, *Armen- und Bettelordnungen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der öffentlichen Armenpflege* (*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, II, 4); F. Lorenz, *Zur Geschichte der Zensur und des Schriftwesens in Bayern*. III. *Schwankende Zuständigkeitsverhältnisse in Zensursachen* (*Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, II, 4); P. Matter, *La Prusse au Temps de Bismarck. La Défaillance d'Olmütz* (*Revue Historique*, November); E. Bernheim, *Entstehung und Bedeutung der deutschen Kaisersage* (*Deutsche Rundschau*, October).

AMERICA.

In addition to the regular archives of the Navy Department, the Naval War Records Office has a large collection of papers of officers of the Navy. It is the desire of the superintendent, Mr. Charles W. Stewart, to add to this collection. Log-books, journals, reports, letters, charts, and other material are sought for. The naval records are intelli-

gently administered, and access to them for purposes of historical investigation is liberally afforded. It is to be hoped that they will be largely added to through responses to Mr. Stewart's request.

A conference of the historical societies of the Mississippi Valley was held in St. Louis on September 16. It was resolved to form a federation of the historical societies located within the Louisiana Purchase, for the purpose of publishing historical documents, encouraging historical research, and urging desirable legislation for the preservation of the materials of history. A committee consisting of Professor Alcée Fortier, Mr. Walter B. Douglas, and Reuben Gold Thwaites was appointed to organize this federation. Papers were read by Mr. Warren Upham on "The Progress of the Discovery of the Mississippi Valley", by Alcée Fortier on "The Expedition of Governor Galvez against the British", and by Reuben Gold Thwaites on "The Duties and Purposes of Historical Societies". Messrs. Fortier and Zacharie also told of over fifty volumes of documents discovered in Paris relating to Louisiana, and of similar documents in Spain and Cuba.

The North Central History Teachers' Association has published, in the form of a small pamphlet, its *Proceedings* for the years 1899-1904. Abstracts of many of the papers and discussions are included. Among the subjects discussed may be mentioned "How far is the special study of limited periods of history desirable and practicable in secondary schools?"; "The place of civics in grammar and high schools"; "The purpose in teaching history"; "Cosmopolitanism versus patriotism".

The visit of the earl of Dartmouth in connection with the laying of the corner-stone of the new Dartmouth Hall is a reminder of the origins of the college. The exercises of October 25-26, at Hanover, were accordingly made distinctly historical. Ten historical tableaux pictured incidents in the first half-century of the institution. In an address on "The Origins of Dartmouth College", Professor Francis Brown of Union Seminary, with more insight than has been shown by any other writer, traced the coöperation of four men of like "historic purpose"—Wheelock, Whitefield, Dartmouth, and Governor John Wentworth—in the founding of the college. The sites of the earliest buildings were marked and in President Wheelock's former mansion-house were exhibited over two hundred rare manuscripts, text-books, coins, articles of furniture, and other memorabilia of the days of the first two presidents. At the banquet in his honor, Lord Dartmouth made a speech of marked felicity and grace. The responses of the presidents of Harvard, Yale (by letter), William and Mary, of Elihu Root of Hamilton, and Dr. Charles A. Eastman, of the class of 1887, the latest Indian graduate, all illustrated the thought dominant throughout the celebration, and happily phrased by President Eliot as "transmissive power". The proceedings, including all the speeches, will be published.

The manuscripts presented to the college by Lord Dartmouth, on the

reception of his honorary degree of LL.D., are with a few exceptions those noted under the heading "Wheelock" in the *Index to the Calendar of Manuscripts of the Earl of Dartmouth*. They embrace fifteen letters to Lord Dartmouth from Eleazar Wheelock, John Thornton, John Wentworth, John Wheelock, the Bishop of London, Samuel Lloyd, and from members of the school and college; seventeen letters to various persons from Lord Dartmouth, Eleazar Wheelock, Sir William Johnson, Nathaniel Whittaker, Matthew Graves, from missionaries to the Indians, and from Indian pupils. The college now possesses between seven and eight thousand manuscripts bearing on the early history of the college, the state, the Revolution, the New England churches, and the work among the Indians. They include: the "main collection", 4,200 documents (chiefly on Wheelock and the college), calendared, 1683-1857, and indexed to 1815; about 400 Whittaker papers; about 2,000 McClure papers; about 300 papers of Governor Josiah Bartlett (1774-1794), valuable for New Hampshire and Revolutionary history; 100 miscellaneous manuscripts containing Revolutionary material; journal of Samson Occom, incomplete (1743-1789); journal of John Sergeant, missionary to the Stockbridge Indians (1805); 122 sermons of Eleazar Wheelock; 101 sermons of Professor Roswell Shurtleff (1794-1820); account-book of Chase Tavern, Cornish, N. H. (1788-1795); law-lectures of Charles March (A. B. 1786); and the Cogswell papers (1840).

Under the title *American Political History*, G. P. Putnam's Sons announce a four-volume work, edited by Professor James A. Woodburn, comprising the articles by Alexander Johnston in *Lalor's Cyclopadia*.

Stepping-Stones of American History (Boston and Chicago, W. A. Wilde, 1904, pp. ix, 381) is the title of a book made up of fourteen essays on subjects which the publishers say "seemed to represent the foundation stones in our history". It must be admitted that some of the selections are curious; why, for example, should "The Dutch in New Netherland" be given space as one of fourteen of the most essential stones? Among the contributors are Reuben G. Thwaites, James A. Woodburn, C. H. Van Tyne, and Henry Cabot Lodge. Most of the papers seem well done and the book is likely to have its uses for the general reader and in the school-room.

Mr. George A. Dorsey, of the Field Columbian Museum, has been at work since 1899 collecting the traditions of the North American Indians of Caddoan stock. The results of his labors have recently appeared in the form of three volumes: *Traditions of the Skidi Pawnee* (published by the American Folk-Lore Society, Houghton, 1904, pp. xxvi, 366); and *Traditions of the Arikara*, and *The Mythology of the Wichita*, both published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1904, pp. 202; iii, 351.

The appearance of a new edition of Lewis H. Morgan's *The League of the Iroquois* is a matter of importance to all students of American eth-

nology and history, for it was and must remain an epoch-making book in the science of ethnology. The beautiful edition just published by Dodd, Mead, and Co. (1904, pp. xxiv, 332) seems in every way admirable; certainly it is attractive. The appendixes contain scholarly and appreciative notes by the editor, Mr. Herbert M. Lloyd, who also gives a bibliography of his authorities and of the writings of Morgan; cuts and colored plates illustrate the text, which is accompanied by two good maps.

We have received, reprinted from the *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris* (Vol. I, No. 3), "La Maison d'Albe et les Archives Colombiennes", by Henry Vignaud—an account of the vicissitudes of the Columbian manuscripts and an explanation of how some of them came to be among the archives of the house of Alva. Such of these documents as have appeared in the three collections published since 1891 by the late Duchess of Alva are commented upon. In an appendix Mr. Vignaud sets forth his reasons for concluding that Ferdinand Columbus had no part in the two letters communicated to Las Casas, ordinarily attributed to Toscanelli; a genealogical table showing the descendants of Christopher Columbus is also appended.

In two of the little volumes of "The Trail Makers" series (A. S. Barnes), Professor E. G. Bourne has brought together the principal sources of information relating to De Soto's career and expedition: Buckingham Smith's translations of the "True Relation", by the Gentleman of Elvas, and of De Biedma's "Relation of the Conquest of Florida" (the official report of the expedition by the king's factor); a translation, by the editor, of the relation of Rodrigo Ranjel, De Soto's private secretary, as incorporated in Oviedo's *Historia General de las Indias*; and translations, also by the editor, of extracts from Garcilaso's *La Florida*, embodying quotations from the memoirs of the two soldiers Alonso de Carmona and Juan Coles. The collection ends with Buckingham Smith's life of De Soto and his translation of De Soto's letter to the municipal body of Santiago, Cuba. Not the least important part of these two volumes is the editor's introduction, in which he demonstrates that the chapters included from Oviedo, if not actually copied from Ranjel's diary, at least very closely follow it. A comparison with the narrative of the Gentleman of Elvas strengthens Professor Bourne in this conclusion. If he is correct, this document (given here for the first time in English) is the most important of all the accounts of the expedition; it is much more detailed than the brief official account by De Biedma, and its author, the private secretary of De Soto, was in a position to write an authoritative narrative.

Herbert Friedenwald's *The Declaration of Independence* (Macmillan, 1904, pp. xii, 299) endeavors to show "the close interrelation between the development of the authority and jurisdiction of the Continental Congress and the evolution of the sentiment for independence", and to analyze and interpret the Declaration itself.

The Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission has issued volume I of its *Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain*. The documents here calendared are the military papers relating to the American Revolution, deposited in the Royal Institution by Maurice Morgann, secretary to Sir Guy Carleton. The calendar was prepared by the late Benjamin F. Stevens, and this first volume bears witness to his careful and scholarly labor. The earliest document calendared is of 1747; the latest, of July, 1779. Matters of supplies and accounts are much in evidence, while many other subjects find a place: the treatment by Congress of the Convention troops, the Hessian forces, affairs in the south, the Loyalist Corps, etc. (London, 1904, pp. xix, 521, x.)

American History from German Archives, by J. G. Rosengarten, is part XIII of a "Narrative and Critical History prepared at the request of the Pennsylvania-German Society" (Lancaster, Pa., 1904, pp. v, 104). It is largely bibliographical, containing full accounts of the materials, printed and manuscript, of the history of the German soldiers in the American Revolution, and a chapter on "Franklin in Germany". The volume concludes with a reprint of Achenwall's *Observations on North America*.

The Life of John Marshall, by Henry Flanders, originally published as a portion of *The Lives and Times of the Chief Justices of the United States*, has been published as a separate volume by T. and J. W. Johnson and Company (Philadelphia, 1904, pp. x, 278). The publishers' note says that the book is revised, but the extent or character of the revision is not made to appear. Even if without material alteration, the book will have its evident value and interest.

A Spanish view of the War of 1812: *Guerra Anglo-Americana (1812-1815)*, by Joaquin Maria Lazaga (Madrid, 1904), is said by its critics to be an admirable study marked by impartiality and ample professional knowledge of the naval operations of that conflict.

Charles Scribner's Sons have published in book form *Letters from England, 1846-1849*, by Elizabeth Davis Bancroft (1904, pp. xi, 224). These letters, from the wife of the historian and diplomat to members of her family, throw interesting light upon society and manners in the England of the period, and contain many pen-portraits of notable personages.

An important work in military history is being published by Messrs. Methuen: *History of the American Civil War*, by Mr. W. Birkbeck Wood and Major J. E. Edmonds. Especial attention is devoted to the strategical phase of the great conflict, and maps and plans are abundant, as well as critical notes on controverted points.

Professor Walter L. Fleming of the University of West Virginia has under preparation for the A. H. Clark Company of Cleveland a collection of Reconstruction documents, to include official papers, political platforms and speeches, state laws, court decisions, and rare, hitherto unpub-

lished material, relating to churches, schools, the Ku-Klux Klan, the Freedmen's Bureau, the Union League, and other institutions of the period.

Th. Nast. His Period and His Pictures, by Albert Bigelow Paine (Macmillan, 1904, pp. xxi, 583, xx), is a volume at once valuable and unique. The four hundred or more reproductions of Nast's cartoons, prominent among which are those that were the undoing of Tweed, constitute a running commentary on the history of the last forty years.

We have received four little volumes of state history, adapted to the needs of young readers. *With the Makers of Texas*, by H. E. Bolton and E. C. Barker (Austin, Gammel-Satesmen Publishing Co., 1904), is a "source reader" in Texas history. It contains selections from the narratives of Spanish explorers and pioneers — Cabeza de Vaca, Bonilla, La Peña, and others; accounts of the filibusters; military papers relating to the revolt of Texas; narratives by citizens of the republic; and Civil War documents. The selections are illustrated and seem, in the main, to be well chosen. Not so favorable an account can be given of *The Story of Georgia*, by Katharine B. Massey and Laura Glenn Wood (Heath, 1904, pp. iv, 152), a rather badly-proportioned narrative, the sentimentality of which does not seem calculated to produce a healthy patriotism, even in the most juvenile minds. The remaining two volumes are in the Silver, Burdett, and Co. "Stories of the States". J. A. C. Chandler's *Makers of Virginia History* is an attempt to fasten the history of the Old Dominion to the careers of its leading characters. The biographical sketches are very readable, but, in the portion relating to John Smith, Mr. Chandler shows himself to be wholly beyond the reach of Alexander Brown's iconoclastic influence. *The Making of the Empire State*, by Jacques Wardlaw Redway, is an effort to make clear the growth of New York by "the narration of epochal events". Much attention is paid to social and economic development. The opening chapter, on geography, does not leave a very clear impression of the physiographic features of the state, and a relief-map might well have been added. On the whole, however, the book is very readable, is free from sentimentality, and should fulfil its purpose.

Professor Barrett Wendell's *Literary History of America* has been condensed and partly rewritten to serve as a text-book for schools and colleges. The revision, which seems to lack none of the charm of the larger work, bears the title: *A History of Literature in America*, by Barrett Wendell and Chester Noyes Greenough (New York, Scribners, 1904, pp. xvi, 443). In light of the fact that the larger book has already been noticed in these pages, it is sufficient now to praise the skill with which the longer treatise has been reduced into a readable and entertaining volume, which is nowhere merely a dry, forbidding school-book.

Another text-book on American literature, likewise the by-product of the author's larger work, is W. P. Trent's *A Brief History of American*

Literature, in Appleton's "Twentieth Century Text-Books" (New York, 1905 [1904], pp. xii, 277). While this condensed account of the development of American literature necessarily centers around the writers described, still the biographical element is wholly subordinated, and the history is sketched in broad outline rather than with a confusing mass of details. A short bibliography at the end of each chapter furnishes references to the material accessible in the average school library. The tone of the book is judicial and fair, not partaking of the self-adulation of many earlier works, nor yet of the self-depreciation recently become popular.

Volume I of William Dawson Johnston's *History of the Library of Congress* has been published by the Library of Congress, and will be reviewed at length in a subsequent number. It is an attractively made up book of over five hundred pages, and covers the period from 1800 to 1864.

A History of Columbia University, 1754-1904, has just appeared from the Columbia University Press (Macmillan, 1904). It is a book of some five hundred pages, published in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of King's College. It contains historical sketches of King's College and Columbia College, by J. H. Van Amringe; of the university and non-professional graduate schools, by Munroe Smith; of the professional schools, by F. S. Lee, F. M. Burdick, H. S. Munroe, and A. D. F. Hamlin; of the affiliated colleges, by W. P. Trent, F. T. Baker, and H. H. Rusby; and of the library, by J. H. Canfield.

The Strategy of Great Railroads, by Frank H. Spearman (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1904, pp. 287), is a collection of historical and descriptive sketches of the principal railway systems in the United States, with especial reference to their interrelations.

Under the title "The 'Mayflower' ", Mr. R. G. Marsden, in the *English Historical Review* for October, attempts to identify the Pilgrims' vessel. The effort is based on research in the recently accessible records of the High Court of Admiralty, and the author reaches the conclusion that the *Mayflower* of the Pilgrims was a boat of that name commanded by one Christopher Jones. Mention of this vessel is first found in 1609. If Mr. Marsden's contention is correct, and the master of the *Mayflower* was Christopher and not Thomas Jones, the theory frequently advanced that the Pilgrims were landed in New England instead of in Virginia contrary to their desires, through the duplicity of the ship's master (a theory based only upon Thomas Jones's known character), appears to have no foundation.

Volume VI of the *Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts* contains the transactions at nine stated meetings held during 1899 and 1900. Many noteworthy articles and some documents of interest are included. A petition (page 7) to the General Assembly of Connecticut,

from the New London Company for Trade, discovered by Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis in the Connecticut archives, shows that that company was in existence as early as 1729. Following this (pages 12-59) are numerous documents found by Mr. John Noble among the Suffolk court files relating to four suits of ejectment (1769-1772), pertaining to lands in the Pemaquid Patent. In a paper on "The Currency and Provincial Politics" (pages 157-172), Mr. Andrew McFarland Davis points out the part that the contest between the governors of Massachusetts and the people, represented by the legislature, over the emission of paper money, played in developing those conditions that brought about the Revolution. A number of documents (pages 172-210), communicated by Mr. Henry H. Edes, relate to the early history of Yale University (1715-1730). Letters (pages 297-305) from Governor Shirley and from William Bollen, of 1743, both to the Lords of Trade, communicated by W. C. Ford, throw light on the violation of the navigation laws and on the illicit trade conducted by the Dutch; while Mr. John Noble furnishes documents (pages 323-335) from the Suffolk court files, relating to the case of Maria (1681), the negress convicted of arson and sentenced to death by burning, and reaches the conclusion that there is but slight evidence that the sentence was carried out. Finally should be mentioned a paper (pages 340-370) by W. C. Ford on "Colonial America"; "Notes on the Proposed Abolition of Slavery in Virginia in 1785" (pages 370-380), by Mr. Albert Matthews; and a discussion (pages 403-414), by A. McF. Davis, of an undated document (here printed) on "Previous Legislation" as a corrective for colonial troubles—a document advocating the exercise of extraordinary powers by Parliament is dealing with the problem of paper currency in the colonies.

The Boston Public Library has received from Mrs. C. W. Folsom a collection of letters selected from the correspondence of her husband, the late Charles W. Folsom, sometime librarian of the Boston Athenæum. Among the letters in the collection are seven from Edward Everett, fifty-six from J. G. Palfrey, ninety-six from W. H. Prescott, seventy-seven from Josiah Quincy, and fifty-five from Jared Sparks.

With volumes II and III of *Public Papers of Daniel D. Tompkins, Governor of New York, Military*, the "Second War with Great Britain" series, edited by Hugh Hastings, state historian of New York, comes to an end. The two volumes cover the years 1805 to 1815; they relate to the defenses of New York city, mainly provided by the state, to the Indian question, to the Canadian and New Jersey boundaries of the state, and to its operations in the War of 1812.

The annual report of the state historian of New York (Assembly Document 68, 1903) bears the title *New York and the War with Spain*. The history of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 69th, and 71st New York Volunteers is set forth, with illustrative documents, and a separate index for the narrative relating to each regiment. The latter part of the report is given

over to Colonel Silas W. Burt's "Memoirs of the Military History of the State of New York during the War for the Union". This is designated Bulletin No. 1 of the "War of the Rebellion" series. The author was in the state military department during the war and the "Memoirs" were written about 1886, largely from memory.

Mr. Archer M. Huntington has presented his Spanish collection to the Hispanic Society of America. A building for the museum and library is to be erected in Audubon Park at 156th Street, New York.

Under the editorship of Frank H. Severance, volume VII of the Buffalo Historical Society *Publications* has just appeared. Pages 1-32 contain several letters, hitherto unprinted, from Jefferson to Francis Adrian van der Kemp, ranging in date from 1788 to 1825. They relate to Jefferson's religious and philosophic views, and contain much of self-revelation. The second contribution in the volume consists of the journals kept by Henry A. S. Dearborn, constituting a record of councils with the Seneca and Tuscarora Indians at Buffalo and Cattaraugus in 1838 and 1839. These councils resulted in the relinquishment of the Buffalo Creek Reservation and the removal of the Indians. Charges of fraud on the part of members of the council in obtaining the consent of the Indians have been frequently made; in the opinion of the editor, the journal clears Dearborn of any such charges. The third part of the volume is given up to papers relating to pioneer surveyors, and includes the "Life of Augustus Porter", by C. M. Robinson; an autobiographical sketch and letters by Augustus Porter; "Life and Adventures of Judah Colt", by himself; Joseph Landon's "Reminiscences", and a survey, made in 1789, of the south shore of Lake Erie. Finally are included a reprint of the *Narrative of the Life and Adventures of Matthew Bunn*, from the 1828 edition, and "The Story of David Ramsay", as taken down by Captain Patrick Campbell in 1792.

We have received the Burrows Brothers reprint from the original 1698 edition of Gabriel Thomas's *Account of Pennsylvania and West New Jersey*, with an introduction by Cyrus Townsend Brady. The original is extremely rare, and the reprint, though limited, is timely. Note should be made of the scale of wages and prices that obtained in Philadelphia about 1690, given on pages 40-45.

Volume XXIII of *Documents Relating to the Colonial History of the State of New Jersey* bears the subtitle *Calendar of New Jersey Wills*, Vol. I, 1670-1730. The editing is by William Nelson, who provides an introductory note of nearly ninety pages on the early testamentary laws and customs of New Jersey. Volume XXIV is Vol. V of *Newspaper Extracts*, and covers the years 1762-1765; while the extracts are largely of social and economic interest, many are of political importance, especially those that reflect the state of feeling in regard to the Stamp Act.

The leading article in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* for October is of genealogical interest: "The English Ance-

tors of the Shippen Family and Edward Shippen, of Philadelphia," by Thomas Willing Balch. The concluding instalment of "Letters of Thomas Jefferson to Charles Willson Peale, 1796-1825" covers the years 1813-1825. The letters relate to agricultural implements, watches, and polygraphs, as well as to the writer's health and personal affairs.

The Putnams have published a reprint of Olmsted's *A Journey in the Seaboard Slave States* (two volumes, 1904), first published in 1856. It contains a short sketch of Olmsted's life by F. L. Olmsted, Jr., and an appreciative introduction by W. P. Trent. There was little need of editorial annotation, and little was attempted, but the well-written pages of the introduction distinctly add to the value of the volumes, because they properly appraise them. A native of the south, and a careful student of its past, Professor Trent declares that Olmsted's work "does not need comment or corroboration", and that the traveler was "explicit, cautious and transparently honest, in his statements". Only one serious criticism is made—the absence of description of the simple, pleasant, ingenuous, and rather dignified life of the older families of well-established social standing.

The opening article in the *Publications of the Southern History Association* for November is the first instalment of a sketch of "Vice-President Andrew Johnson", by David M. Dewitt. In most melodramatic language the author of *The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson* portrays Johnson's inauguration as Vice-President. The documents in this number consist of correspondence of General Joseph Martin (1778-1782), relating to the Cherokees, and a letter signed by Gamaliel Bailey, editor of the *National Era*, relating to the financial fortunes of that abolitionist paper.

The Site of Old "James Towne", by Samuel H. Yonge, published by the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities (Richmond, 1904, pp. 86), is based upon surveys made by the author while in charge of the work by the United States Engineer Department for the protection of Jamestown Island from the encroachments of the James river, and upon a careful examination of the Virginia land patent records, the Ambler manuscripts, and other original sources, as well as the more important secondary authorities. The results of the surveys and examination are shown in a map drawn by Otto Sonne, which gives "James Citty" as it was between 1607 and 1698, showing roads, estates, boundaries, forts, bridges, etc. Mr. Yonge does not believe that the abrasion of the island began before 1700, and he estimates the strip lost since that date to have been only five hundred feet in width. Among the specific subjects treated in the text may be mentioned the landing-place of the first settlers, the population, the location of the first fort and town, and the sites of block-houses, church buildings, the original graveyard, and the state-houses.

We have already referred to the projected publication by the Library of Congress of the records of the London Company for Virginia, in two

volumes. The Library now announces its intention to publish a third volume, which will contain the records of the company, other than its minutes, now in the Division of Manuscripts, together with the letters, commissions, records of cases, and other papers discovered in England by Miss Susan M. Kingsbury during the past year.

Among the continuations in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* for October may be mentioned the letters of Edward Montagu, the Virginia agent in England, of the year 1770, and the "Diary of the Journey of the First Colony of Single Brethren to North Carolina, October 8–November 17, 1753". A letter by Robert Bolling, narrating his Revolutionary services as captain of the Petersburg Troop of Horse, 1778–1781, is also printed, as is, under Notes and Queries, a petition found among the Ambler manuscripts from the people of Jamestown to the Virginia assembly, in 1682, relating to lands, houses, and sanitary regulations.

Among the documents in the *William and Mary College Quarterly* for October are three letters from the correspondence of James McHenry, and extracts from letters of William T. Barry. The former, written during the years 1796 and 1799, refer to the attempt on the part of Virginia to prevent shipments of horses to the West Indies for the British government, and to the alien and sedition laws. The latter, 1803–1804, are descriptive, containing accounts of Williamsburg and the college, Yorktown, and Richmond.

The *West Virginia Historical Magazine* for October contains a reproduction of the original map of Charleston (West Virginia), found among the papers of William Clendenen.

In the *South Atlantic Quarterly* for October, the editor, John Spencer Bassett, reviews, under the title "A Revival of Interest in North Carolina History", the most noteworthy of recent works on North Carolina. The second and apparently concluding part of Helen Henry Hodge's "Massachusetts and the New England Confederation" appears in the same number.

The *North Carolina Booklet* for May, 1904, contains a series of sketches of the eight lords proprietors of Carolina. The work is by Professor K. P. Battle and is of much interest.

The *James Sprunt Historical Monograph* (University of North Carolina) No. 4 contains letters and documents relating to the early history of the lower Cape Fear section (near Wilmington, N. C.); No. 5 contains the minutes of the second Baptist Association in North Carolina (Kekukee), 1769–1777. Both of these are edited by Professor K. P. Battle.

The Alabama Department of Archives and History has issued, as *Bulletin No. 3*, a check-list of the newspaper and periodical files in the possession of the department.

A document of unusual interest is included in the *American Historical Magazine and Tennessee Historical Society Quarterly* for October.

This is none other than the Constitution of the State of Franklin, as provisionally adopted in the Jonesboro Convention of December, 1784. It was recently discovered in the office of the Insurance Commissioner, in the capitol at Raleigh, and was printed in the *Charlotte Daily Observer* of September 25, 1904.

The July *Quarterly of the Texas State Historical Association* is devoted almost exclusively to an annotated translation, by Elizabeth Howard West, of Lieutenant Antonio Bonilla's *Breve Compendio de los sucesos ôcurridos en la Provincia de Texas desde su conquista ô reducion hasta la fecha* (Mexico, November 10, 1772). This report is in four parts: a description of the province of Texas in 1772, a summary of its history from 1685 to 1770, a summary of reports by Ripperdá and de Mezières, and an exposition of Bonilla's own views.

The Way to the West, by Emerson Hough (Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1903, pp. 446), aims to tell in a dramatic and popular style the story of western expansion.

The *Life, Letters and Travels of Father Pierre-Jean de Smet*, recently published in four volumes by Francis P. Harper (New York, 1905), consists of the journals, letter-books, and printed works of the Flemish missionary, and should be a valuable source of information relative to the Western Indians between 1838 and 1872. The writings are edited by Major Hiram M. Chittenden, U. S. A., and Alfred T. Richardson, who supply geographical, historical, and ethnological notes as well as a biographical sketch of Father de Smet.

Mr. C. M. Burton of Detroit has reprinted in a pamphlet of twenty pages an article entitled "Historical Memoranda of the Territory of Michigan", which originally appeared in serial form in the *Detroit Gazette*, commencing May 21, 1819. As Mr. Burton says of it, its chief value "lies in the fact that it was written shortly after the conclusion of the War of 1812, and it relates the details of the surrender of Detroit as only could be narrated by one who was an eye-witness or a participant in that inglorious event".

The Wisconsin State Historical Society held its fifty-second annual meeting on October 27. William M. Wright was elected president in place of R. L. McCormick, who declined reelection. The superintendent, Dr. Thwaites, reported that volume XVII of the *Collections* is in press and contains material that throws much new light upon the French régime in the region of the upper Great Lakes between 1727 and 1749. Of especial interest is the announcement by Dr. Thwaites that a bulletin of information relating to the society's manuscript collections is to be issued during the coming year.

The important article in *Annals of Iowa* for October is "Legislation in Iowa prior to 1858", by Professor F. I. Herriott. This essay of thirty-five pages is an attempt "to analyze and compare the enactments of Iowa's legislature and from the experience of a typical state to determine if possible what the real nature and drift of our laws have been".

The *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* for October contains "The Negro and Slavery in Early Iowa", by Louis Pelzer, "Some Phases of Corporate Regulation in the State of Iowa", by Frank Edward Horack, and "Assembly Districting and Apportionment in Iowa", by Benjamin F. Shambaugh. Although the last two of these articles are historical in their treatment, the first is of most general interest; it deals with the political phases of the question, and the attitude of the state toward such measures as the Missouri compromise and the fugitive slave law.

Volumes V and VI of the *Messages and Proclamations of the Governors of Iowa*, edited by Benjamin F. Shambaugh, are at hand. The former covers the terms of John Henry Gear (1878-1882) and of Buren Robinson Sherman (1882-1886); the latter, those of William Larrabee (1886-1890) and of Horace Boies (1890-1894). The editor points out that this last period marks the only Democratic administration since 1856.

We have received *The Boundaries of Colorado*, by Frederic L. Paxson, reprinted from the *University of Colorado Studies* for July, 1904.

A Short History of Oregon, by Sidona V. Johnson (McClurg, 1904), is, as suggested on the title-page, a compilation. The three hundred small octavo pages are grouped in six parts: Discovery, Exploration, Settlement, Government, Indian Wars, and Progress. The part relating to the settlement of Oregon is the longest; of the Whitman controversy the author says: "It has settled beyond dispute, in the minds of those who have given the matter just and careful consideration, the permanent and exalted position Dr. Whitman must ever occupy in the annals of Oregon" (p. 236). Although the *History* is "compiled from the leading accepted authorities", there are no notes to indicate these authorities. The text contains some original documents as well as excerpts from Blaine's *Twenty Years in Congress* and the Bancroft volume on Oregon.

The Oregon Historical Society *Quarterly* for September contains the first part of the "Literary Remains of David Douglas, Botanist of the Oregon Country" consisting of extracts from his manuscript journal in the library of the Horticultural Society of London: "Sketch of a Journey to the Northwestern Parts of the Continent of North America during the Years 1824-25-26-27."

The History of California and Its Missions, by Bryan J. Clinch, in two volumes, is announced by Whitaker and Ray of San Francisco. The period covered is from the explorations of Cortez to the acquisition of California by the United States.

At the de Monts tercentenary celebration during the past summer by the Nova Scotia Historical Society, Reuben Gold Thwaites delivered the greetings of the American Historical Association; his address was printed in the *Canadian Magazine* for August and has also been issued separately.

The *Acadiensis* for July-October is devoted to Champlain. A translation, mostly new, of Champlain's narrative, with maps and views

photographically reproduced from the original edition of 1613, is contributed by W. F. Ganong, while Victor Hugo Paltsits presents "A Critical Examination of Champlain's Portraits", with reproductions of the Ducornet, Hamel, O'Neil, Laverdière, and Ronjat portraits of the explorer. "Samuel de Champlain", by James Phinney Baxter, is a biographical sketch.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Albert Perry Brigham, *Geography and History in the United States* (Journal of Geography, October); Talcott Williams, *George Frisbie Hoar* (Review of Reviews, November); G. Mercer Adam, *Professor Goldwin Smith* (Canadian Magazine, December); F. H. Hodder, *Early Maps of America* (Dial, December 1); John M. Gunn, *History of the Queres Pueblos of Laguna and Acoma* (Records of the Past, October); Henry Loomis Nelson, *Frontenac* (Harper's Magazine, October); Helen Henry Hodge, *The Massachusetts Oligarchy* (Sewanee Review, October); George P. Costigan, Jr., *The History of the Adoption of Section I of Article IV of the United States Constitution and a Consideration of the Effect on Judgments of that Section and of Federal Legislation* (Columbia Law Review, November); Gaston Jèze, *Du rôle des chambres dans l'approbation ou l'exécution des traités internationaux d'après la Constitution des États-Unis de l'Amérique du Nord* (Revue du Droit Public, July-September); General James Grant Wilson, *Washington, Lincoln, and Grant* (Cornhill Magazine, October); *Some Family Letters of Thomas Jefferson* (Scribner's Magazine, November); William R. Shepherd, *The Cession of Louisiana to Spain* (Political Science Quarterly, September); Frederick Jackson Turner, *The Advance of the West*, a review of Volumes I-VIII, *Early Western Travels*, edited by R. G. Thwaites (Dial, November 16); *New Material Concerning the Lewis and Clark Expedition* (Century, October); Eugene L. Didier, *James Buchanan as a Lawyer* (The Green Bag, October); Walter L. Fleming, *Negro Slavery in Illinois*, review of *History of Negro Servitude in Illinois*, by N. Dwight Harris (Dial, November 16); John H. Moore, *Non-Intervention and the Monroe Doctrine* (Harper's Magazine, November); Nicholas Murray Butler, *From King's College to Columbia University* (Educational Review, December); Dr. Magnac, *L'expédition du général Leclerc à Saint-Domingue* (running in Le Carnet); Jerónimo Becker, *La guerra del Pacífico* (running in La España Moderna).